

PHASE 1 REPORT and PHASE 2 PROCESS DESIGN DRAFT



Submitted by
Sara A. Peterson and Anne R. Carroll
peterson@sarapetersonconsulting.com
May 10, 2012

Table of Contents

Section 1: Phase 1 Overview	3
1.1 Purpose and Objectives	3
1.2 Workshop 1: Stakeholder Identification and Analysis (19 April 2012)	3
1.2.1 Purpose	3
1.2.2 Design	3
1.2.3 Participants	3
1.3 Workshop 2: Preliminary Process Design (20 April 2012)	4
1.3.1 Purpose	4
1.3.2 Design	4
1.3.3 Participants	4
Section 2: Phase 1 Workshop Results	6
2.1 Key Stakeholders	6
2.2 Desired Characteristics of Process and Plan	6
2.2.1 Process	7
2.2.2 Product	8
2.3 Agreed-upon Process Goals and Promise to Stakeholders	9
2.4 Stakeholder Questions for Input	9
2.5 Hopes and Fears	11
2.5.1 Hopes	11
2.5.2 Fears	13
Section 3: Phase 2 Preliminary Process Design	14
3.1 Goal and Promise to Stakeholders	14
3.2 Process Oversight and Guidance	14
3.3 Preliminary Design Framework	16
Section 4: Stakeholder Engagement Plan	20
4.1 Providers to Engage (plus others to be identified)	29
4.2 Information-Only Stakeholders	30
Section 5: Appendix	31
5.1 Blueprint 2 Stakeholder Identification and Analysis Workshop Overview	31
5.2 Process and Document Recommendations from 2011 Blueprint 2 Draft Release	32
5.3 IAP2's Public Participation Spectrum	33

Section 1: Phase 1 Overview

This section provides a high-level explanation of Phase 1 of the Blueprint 2¹ planning process.

1.1 Purpose and Objectives

Phase 1 was explicitly created to collaboratively plan the process of developing a new Blueprint 2 in 2012, and get community approval to proceed with that plan. A selection committee convened by CHIP identified the consulting team of Sara A. Peterson and Anne Carroll to guide Phase 1. The consultants designed two workshops to “build” the plan with deep stakeholder input. CHIP supported these efforts by providing all communications, logistics, hosting, and organizational support.

We are most grateful to all participants for their great energy and goodwill, and to the American Red Cross for providing lovely space and timely support for both workshops.

This section provides information on the purpose, design, and participants for each of the workshops.

See the following sections for Workshop Results and the Phase 2 Preliminary Process Design.

1.2 Workshop 1: Stakeholder Identification and Analysis (19 April 2012)

1.2.1 Purpose

At this workshop participants identified and analyzed the stakeholders who are most relevant to *developing the 2012 Blueprint 2*. An important distinction was made between the much broader group of stakeholders engaged in the overall effort to prevent and end homelessness, and those who were critical to the task of collaboratively completing a robust and successful Blueprint 2.

For the purpose of this workshop, a stakeholder was defined as an individual or group that can make a claim on the attention, resources, or output of this Blueprint 2 project, or is affected by the work or activities.

1.2.2 Design

This highly participatory four-hour workshop was structured around the following final agenda:

- Welcome and introductions
- Introduce stakeholder process
- Stakeholder identification and analysis
- Cleaning the map
- Connecting the dots
- Next steps

1.2.3 Participants

CHIP extended invitations for both workshops to their full distribution list, with nearly 2700 successful email deliveries. The list includes staff from service and housing agencies; philanthropic, corporate, and individual donors; volunteers; advocates; and others. Workshop attendees are listed below.

¹ For purposes of this Report, we have used “Blueprint 2” simply because of its familiarity to stakeholders, understanding that the name may change as the process moves forward.

NAME	AGENCY/ORGANIZATION
Amber Ames	Stopover, Inc.
Lori Casson	Dayspring Center, Inc. (CHIP board)
Jennifer Charles	U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Devel.
Stephanie Derrick	Coburn Place Safe Haven
Crimsetta Dunn	Street Reach Homeless Ministry
Terri Garcia	Southeast Neighborhood Community Services
Frank Hagaman	Advocate
Douglas Hairston	Front Porch Alliance (Mayor's office) and CHIP board
Joan Harvey	Indianapolis Public Library
Eric Howard	Outreach, Inc.
Kate Hussey	School on Wheels
John Joannette	Horizon House
Mary Jones	United Way of Central Indiana
Leslie Kelly	Horizon House
Julie Marsh	Domestic Violence Network
Kelly McBride	Domestic Violence Network
Bill Moreau	CHIP board
JoAnn Morris	Homeless Initiative Program
Cal Nelson	Wheeler Mission Ministries
Craig Neef	Trusted Mentors
Sue Reed	Advocacy Council
Kate Rowland	Homeless Initiative Program
Brianna Sauer	Homeless Initiative Program
Michael Schwing	Dinaris House Corporation and Advocacy Council
Sharon Stark	HealthNet/Homeless Initiative Program (CHIP board)
Katrina Upshaw	Coburn Place
Jeri Warner	Trusted Mentors
Robert Weiler	Indiana University School of Social Work

1.3 Workshop 2: Preliminary Process Design (20 April 2012)

1.3.1 Purpose

In this five-hour workshop, participants incorporated the stakeholder results and framed a process to authentically and transparently engage stakeholders in developing a robust and successful Blueprint 2.

1.3.2 Design

Participants worked through a series of interconnected design exercises with this final agenda:

- Welcome and introductions
- Desired process and plan characteristics and outcomes
- Select process goal and “promise”
- Connecting the dots
- Next steps and reflections



1.3.3 Participants

CHIP extended invitations for both workshops to their full distribution list, with nearly 2700 successful

email deliveries. The list includes staff from service and housing agencies; philanthropic, corporate, and individual donors; volunteers; advocates; and others. Workshop attendees are listed below.

NAME	AGENCY/ORGANIZATION
Amber Ames	Stopover, Inc.
Lori Casson	Dayspring Center, Inc, (CHIP Board)
Jennifer Charles	U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Christina Davis	Holy Family Services
Stephanie Derrick	Coburn Place Safe Haven
Crimsetta Dunn	Street Reach Homeless Ministry
Jennifer Fults	City of Indianapolis
Terri Garcia	Southeast Neighborhood Community Services
Doris Harris	Advocate
Tom Harris	Advocate
Joan Harvey	Indianapolis Public Library
Cassandra Hughey	Partners in Housing Grant Per Diem Program
John Joannette	Horizon House
Mary Jones	United Way of Central Indiana
Steve Karn	CHIP board
Linda A Kassis	Mary Rigg Neighborhood Center
Julia Kathary	Coburn Place Safe Haven
Leslie Kelly	Horizon House
Julie Marsh	Domestic Violence Network
Kelly McBride	Domestic Violence Network
Jim McElhinney	Indianapolis Interfaith Hospitality Network
Randy Miller	Drug Free Marion County
JoAnn Morris	Homeless Initiative Program
Sue Reed	Advocacy Council
Brianna Sauer	Homeless Initiative Program
Michael Schwing	Dinaris House Corporation and Advocacy Council
Todd Sears	CHIP board
Stephanie A Sideman	Corporation for Supportive Housing
Sharon Stark	HealthNet/Homeless Initiative (CHIP board)
Chris Strait	Horizon House
Marla K Taylor	Domestic Violence Network
Katrina Upshaw	Coburn Place
Robert Weiler	Indiana University School of Social Work
Kay Wiles	Homeless Initiative Program
Carter Wolf	CHIP board



Section 2: Phase 1 Workshop Results

Workshop participants worked with exceptional diligence and care to first identify key stakeholders for the Blueprint 2 development process, and then provide critical guidance on the Phase 2 Preliminary Process Design. Results from both workshops are combined below, providing the foundation for the design in the following section.

2.1 Key Stakeholders

Workshop participants took this work very seriously and produced comprehensive and carefully analyzed results as shown in the photos. The key stakeholders are incorporated into the draft Stakeholder Engagement Plan included in the Phase 2 Preliminary Process Design section below.

Workshop participants first practiced identifying stakeholders with enough specificity to determine how they fit into the Blueprint 2 process. Then working individually, in teams, and as a whole group, they moved from a brainstormed pile of potential stakeholders to a carefully analyzed list that is ready to be further refined and serve as the anchor for Phase 2 stakeholder engagement.



2.2 Desired Characteristics of Process and Plan

The purpose of this exercise was to identify critical criteria for a successful Blueprint development *process* and *product*. The results of this brainstorming exercise help provide broad guidance for subsequent work are shown below, *categorized after the fact by the consulting team*.



2.2.1 Process

Inclusive, Trusted, Intentional

- Highly inclusive/stakeholders, ideas, strategies (2)
- All opinions valued
- Make people feel comfortable
- Facilitator should help all involved to build relationships of trust
- Identifies everyone's interests
- Inclusive of / engages all stakeholders in appropriate ways
- Intentional engagement and inclusivity
- Intentional engagement / re-engagement of key stakeholders (if drop out, way to get back)
- Process includes consensus for the goals
 - Building competencies among clients and general public to gain effective input

Communicated, Accessible, Transparent

- Informing all key stakeholder of the process
- Communicated currently – results of meetings published within a couple of days
- Process documentation readily available
- Public repository of information
- Broad communication channels (utilize all available social media outlets)
- Easily accessed details (who, what, when, where)
- Transparency
 - Clear, concise communication to identified stakeholders and general public
 - Mapping out communication process
 - Access to receive continued updates (web)
- Well-communicated, who is doing what?
- Participants know both what happens in and outside of public meetings
- Establish clear roles / identify roles (e.g., who will be responsible for communicating steps with the community, when we do not know what is going on – who to call)

Open, Adaptable, True to Input

- Continuous engagement of stakeholders
- Build in forums / feedback loops
- Process is flexible based on stakeholder input
- Respect difference – we can have more than one answer and should consider multiple strategies

Grounded in Data and Experience

- Reflects on feedback from Blueprint 1 and 2 draft – benchmark status, question interim evaluations
- Evidence based
- Data-driven (through various processes – previous Blueprints, survey, focus groups, etc.)

Comprehensive, Well-Managed

- Variety of methods to gather input
- Well-coordinated, builds collaboration amongst the partners
- Has defined milestones
- Timely
- Detailed

Public

- Process is driven by community, not just a few vested parties (“everyday Joe” that understands greater impact, benefits of the product / plan)
- Ongoing community meetings (summits)
- Large community town hall meeting early in the process for input

Client-Oriented

- Represents the people it is designed to serve
- Client involvement – addressing barriers (e.g., meals, transportation, confidence to share input)
- More involvement of the homeless that are outside of a specific program – those who are on the street that do not come in for services – what do they need to get out of homelessness

Attentive to Specific Stakeholder Groups

- Include front line workers, outreach, case managers, employment specialists as well as decision makers in the service provider community
- Needs to include philanthropic community
- Strategic engagement of key financial alliances (philanthropic foundations, city, state, and mainstream benefits)
- Strategic engagement of political figures that may influence legislation, funding
- Include representatives from sectors of wrap around services – medical, vision, dental, mental health, employment, etc.
- Include student interns

2.2.2 Product

Clear, Accessible, Public Case for Change

- Clear, concise, understandable strategies
- Understandable by the community at large
- Serves as education for stakeholders, funders, general public, elected officials
- Serves as a tool that unifies us / the community
- “Super Bowl” case – clearly show how Blueprint support has positive impact on the community
- Tone is professional
- Use inclusive language – no us / them

Dynamic

- Should be fluid – adaptable to new situations, changes needs of community
- Living, breathing, changeable document
- Plan includes a process for review

Data-Driven, Need-Based

- Should include a baseline
- Informed by full range of information and data available
- Evidence-based as informed by the process
- Client-informed / consumer-based goals
- Represent the people designed to serve

Grounded in Experience

- Builds in innovation, best practice
- Informed by successful strategies outside of Indianapolis
- Continuity between Blueprint 1 and 2
- Reflects the learning from Blueprint 1 evaluation
- Identify the successful components of Blueprint 1
- Reflects gains and remaining gaps

Measurable and Evaluated

- Has clear benchmarks
- Defined method of measuring success
- Measurable outcomes
- Evaluation component/plan built in document
- Ongoing evaluation

Visionary

- Have a vision
- Includes long-terms goals and vision even if not achievable – unforeseeable future, stretch goals

Comprehensive

- Solutions from served and un-served homeless individuals and families
- Address newly homeless and chronically homeless
- Address full spectrum of programs and services
- Well-received, fundable strategies

Realistic, Actionable, Achievable

- Achievable goals /components
- Actionable
- Realistic – achievable, measurable steps, measurable outcomes
- Achievable / realistic based in commitment (time, resources, staff) of stakeholders
- Phasing with targets aimed at long-term goals
- Realistic impact

Financially Responsible

- Identifies current and potential resources
- Acknowledge the real impact of overall costs
- Ties strategies to resources
- Financial planning (attainable, identifiable) identifies specific strategies for funding each goal

Accountable - Who, What and When

- Clarifies who is responsible to do what by when to reach desired outcomes
- Details involvement of partners in implementation
- Demonstrates who was involved / is involved
- Clearly outlines next steps / a clear timeline
- Addresses accountability for both action and performance of plan and programs / services

Supported

- Align all interests
- Highlights power of collaboration, joint efforts...
- Good will / commitment endorsement of key components or of the entire product (more buy-in support if a cafeteria plan?)
- Product supported by constituents to move plan forward and influence political / community decision makers

Transparent

- Can tell who was at the table and/or contributed
- Trail so public is adequately informed

2.3 Agreed-upon Process Goals and Promise to Stakeholders

Working from the Spectrum for Public Participation developed by the International Association for Public Participation (IAP2), participants examined the *overall* process goals and promise to stakeholders. This will be used to guide the process design and implementation, and will be broadly communicated. Note that individual events and activities within the process may support more or less stakeholder input; this commitment is for the overall process. (See Appendix for more detail.)

Level of Engagement	Involve
Engagement Goal	To work directly with stakeholders throughout the process to ensure that stakeholder concerns and aspirations are consistently understood and considered.
Promise to Stakeholders	<p>We will work with you to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that your concerns and aspirations are directly reflected in the alternatives developed and • Provide feedback on how stakeholder input influenced the decision

2.4 Stakeholder Questions for Input

For several key categories of stakeholders, participants developed critical questions to drive the stakeholder engagement process, and identified the purpose of those questions – i.e., how that input would be used to inform the eventual plan/product. Those results are combined below and incorporated into the draft Stakeholder Engagement Plan. Final questions *for these and other stakeholder categories* will be developed in collaboration with the process team selected for subsequent phases.



Government	
1. What are your priorities and goals around homelessness?	• Frame potential funding priorities
2. What are your policies and administrative strategies related to homelessness?	• Identify fundable strategies/activities
3. What role does your organization currently play in reducing/ending homelessness? How do you envision your role in the future?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examines the role of convening entities • Frame a community-wide vision
4. What resources do you provide related to homelessness? What are the sources?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish funding baseline • Maximizing resources (efficiency, effectiveness)
5. What are the primary objectives of these expenditures?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify decision-making process and parties for funding decisions
6. What are the barriers or restrictions on the resources you provide?	• Fundable strategies
Collaboratives	
7. What gaps do you see in the continuum of programs and services?	• Baseline program/service inventory

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (asset mapping) • Gaps analysis • Basis for action plan
8. What are the service gaps?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gaps analysis
9. What are the resource gaps?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gaps analysis
10. What are the barriers, constraints, and limitations on the funding you provide?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify fundable strategies/activities
11. In what ways are you optimizing the benefit of the funding you provide?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify fundable strategies/activities • Inform evaluation
12. What role does your organization currently play in reducing/ending homelessness?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examines the role of convening entities • Frame a community-wide vision
13. How do you envision your role in the future?	
14. With what organizations can you better coordinate in order to be more effective?	
15. What programs/services are vital (most effective) for people experiencing homelessness? For whom and in what way? How do you know?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Best practices • Gaps analysis • Funding sources and strategies
Providers (including activists)	
16. Who do you serve and in what way? What are their unique needs? What are the restrictions or limitations for your programs and services? What is your program capacity? What are your funding sources?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline program/service inventory (asset mapping) • Funding inventory
17. What strategies yield the most successful outcomes for your clients? For whom/what? What data/collection systems do you have? What kinds of evaluation do you do?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Best practices, innovation • Evaluation
18. What are the barriers that prevent you from better serving clients?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gaps analysis
19. In what ways are you or could you collaborate in order to improve outcomes for those you serve? In what ways are those formalized? What has and hasn't worked? Where are there duplications? In what ways are you unique?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Best practices • Fundable strategies • Improve outcomes
20. What different resources are necessary to improve outcomes?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve outcomes
21. What programs/service gaps to you see? How do you know?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline program/service inventory (asset mapping) • Gaps analysis
22. What are the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats to the programs and services you offer?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gaps analysis • Fundable strategies
23. What is the role of advocacy in ending homelessness?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determine the role of advocacy in the Blueprint
24. What does a full "continuum of care" in Indianapolis mean to you? Where is the community strong? Where is it weak?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vision and goals • Key priorities • Gaps analysis
25. Who is not being served or not being served well by anyone? Why not? How do you know?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gaps analysis • Key priorities

People experiencing homelessness	
26. What contributed to your homelessness? What do you need and what are the barriers to your becoming self-sufficient and getting permanent housing?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gaps analysis • Key strategies • Best practices
Fundors	
27. What are your primary concerns related to preventing and ending homelessness? What requests <i>aren't</i> you seeing or needs <i>aren't</i> being addressed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vision and goals • Funding opportunities and needs • Gaps analysis
28. What are your current funding priorities around homelessness? What are your future plans in this arena? What might change those priorities/ plans?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding inventory • Funding opportunities and needs
29. What lessons have you learned about what does and doesn't work around homelessness?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key priorities • Best practices • Evaluation
30. What outcomes do you expect for your funding?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation • Goals
31. What are your decision-making criteria for funding? How important are things like the population served, collaboration, specific programs or services, evaluation / outcomes, etc.?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key priorities • Funding opportunities and needs
32. What opportunities exist to better align actual needs, program/services, and funding to more effectively improve outcomes?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vision and goals • System design • Outcomes

Additional issues raised: Underlying a number of the questions were some education, awareness, and system issues that will need addressing very early in Phase 2. There are troubling gaps of knowledge along with misunderstandings about how the system of funding, programs, and services works in this community. In order for stakeholders to contribute to this effort they have to understand the system better. Related to this, there is a clear desire to clarify, better understand, and improve the COC process and outcomes.

2.5 Hopes and Fears

On both days we asked participants to list their hopes and fears for the process and plan. Below are the combined results from the two days.

2.5.1 Hopes

- Continued transparency
- We are listened to
- This process will be very successful
- That we complete a great Blueprint
- It works!



- This will come to fruition
- Accumulation of support from the ground up
- Continue to be a transparent process that is able to transcend egos and positions and is a meaningful process
- That it's a strength-based process and the successes of the first Blueprint are recognized
- Next session is as successful and productive as today!



- I think the amount of energy and understanding and knowledge that contributed to the work of the last two days was incredible and amazing. Starting out I was rather overwhelmed by the task at hand. I hope all of that energy and knowledge can keep the momentum of this process flowing smoothly into the future and results in positive outcomes for people experiencing homelessness.
- Possibility for large group community input early in the process
- The homeless people that we serve are involved going forward
- This public participation spectrum we did will work out to help this process and improve relations with the collaborative intended
- Move to collaboration
- We have vibrant in depth asset map with gaps analysis to help guide good decision-making for use of precious and limited financial resources
- That we develop a Blueprint based on an honest and accurate assessment of where we are and that challenges us to accomplish realistic “stretch” goals
- That it continues to be a process that engages stakeholders of varying degrees and backgrounds – a diverse group who are all interested in creating a Blueprint that is a living, breathing document that will truly make an impact on homelessness in our community
- My hope is that the Mayor takes ownership of the Blueprint 2 drafting process
- I really don't have any (hopes) as the Blueprint does not affect anything, any corporation or business I own, represent, or which I am on the board of.
- Momentum/ engagement continues through implementation
- We identify a strong set of committed individuals that can take our work here today and manage a successful process toward clear goals that strengthen the community's ability to serve out homeless neighbors
- That many people remain engaged in the process
- The process and product produce greater community support and involvement
- Level of engagement continues – result will be a strong product that we can all get behind
- Provides opportunities for policy changes positively impacting homeless population
- Greater collaboration among all stakeholders yields better outcomes for folks who are homeless
- This will be a complete process and result in a successful Blueprint
- This process for the Blueprint WILL end homelessness in Indy. I also hope ending homelessness becomes a goal throughout our country
- To eventually have a true continuum of care that serves vulnerable populations and is recognized with funders as well as providers
- I have a sense of excitement that the homeless population will be served well and that networks will be strengthened

- In the end we will see a “Blueprint Network” where members will be collaborating and working together to end homelessness, and that clients will get better served when they use services within the “Blueprint Network”
- This can have impact 5 years out
- The blueprint will help create real change for the homeless in Marion County
- That the homeless may be soon eliminated as a problem in our city
- The process continues and will lead to a usable, relevant plan to guide the provision of services to our homeless neighbors
- This process leads to a better way of serving the homeless, creating a roadmap (Blueprint) that has full stakeholder buy-in and that we see results someday that can be attributed to the Blueprint
- “We” are responsible and committed to doing the difficult work now and in the future

2.5.2 Fears

- The problem may increase!
- We won't be [listened to]
- We do all this work and nothing comes of it
- When we leave here the momentum will die and nothing will get done
- That the process won't continue as planned and that we never finalize the plan
- That this process will dead end
- Goes on forever
- The process will get derailed at the next few steps – particularly engaging the resources (consultants, staff) necessary to shepherd the process
- Egos get in the way of progress.
- That we will all go back into our silos
- Stakeholders will be ok with their “role”
- We will drop the ball, have no accountability, and that we don't push ourselves to do more or different than what we have done up to this point
- Getting bogged down in the details
- We become threatened by the process or need for change and disengage or resort to old ways
- My fear is that Blueprint 2 will be viewed as the “CHIP perpetuation process”
- We promise involvement and hope for collaboration but won't get there because it's hard
- We will lose momentum of real collaboration
- It gets so complicated that momentum is lost (bystander apathy)
- Ideas, opinions and needs of the homeless will be under-represented but what I heard today is encouraging
- Not all stakeholders will participate and the Blueprint will not be effective
- Things may not be executed / implemented the way they need to be
- The Blueprint 2.0 will become a “shelf” document and not positively impact those we serve
- Blueprint becomes another plan of many that sits on a shelf
- We will do all this work and CHIP will ignore it
- Already feel much better about going forward



Section 3: Phase 2 Preliminary Process Design

This section brings all stakeholder guidance together with the consulting team’s perspective to yield a draft process design for Phase 2. This will be carefully vetted and refined by stakeholders, and implementation will be explicitly collaborative, inclusive, and transparent.

3.1 Goal and Promise to Stakeholders

These were selected based on the stakeholder contributions during the design workshop tied to the Spectrum for Public Participation of the International Association for Public Participation (IAP2).

Level of Engagement	Involve
Engagement Goal	To work directly with stakeholders throughout the process to ensure that stakeholder concerns and aspirations are consistently understood and considered.
Promise to Stakeholders	We will work with you to: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ensure that your concerns and aspirations are directly reflected in the alternatives developed and• Provide feedback on how stakeholder input influenced the decision

Not discussed in depth at the workshop but exceptionally relevant to the final design and implementation are the **IAP2 Core Values**. We would expect these to be adopted prior to moving forward. They were included in the Spectrum handout for participants and are as follows:

IAP2 Core Values for Public Participation:

- Is based on the belief that those who are affected by a decision have a right to be involved in the decision-making process.
- Includes the promise that the public's contribution will influence the decision.
- Promotes sustainable decisions by recognizing and communicating the needs and interests of all participants, including decision makers.
- Seeks out and facilitates the involvement of those potentially affected by or interested in a decision.
- Seeks input from participants in designing how they participate.
- Provides participants with the information they need to participate in a meaningful way.
- Communicates to participants how their input affected the decision.

3.2 Process Oversight and Guidance

Per the stakeholder discussion during the design workshop, it was decided that there not be a traditional steering committee for the remainder of the Blueprint 2 process. The design and stakeholder engagement plan should be inclusive and comprehensive enough to move in another direction.

Rather, the group moved toward creating a smaller team charged with serving as process advisors and accountability stewards. This group would be responsible for tasks such as:

- Providing ongoing guidance on the stakeholder involvement process
- Helping ensure *all* stakeholders’ voices are heard

- Helping stakeholders understand and trust the process
- Encouraging stakeholders to get and stay involved
- Welcoming participants to community sessions
- Helping maintain transparent and accessible stakeholder and community communications
- Helping manage the Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP):
 - Using their networks to update/refine stakeholder-related information
 - Reviewing draft engagement protocols developed by consultants
 - Reviewing input along the way to ensure objectives are being met, and recommending appropriate adjustments
- Acting as the metaphoric “trunk” of communication trees as needed
- Reaching out to particular stakeholders to re-engage them if necessary
- Working with the consulting team and other stakeholders to help review, organize, and share stakeholder input at all stages of the process

These people are *not* there to represent any stakeholders – *because stakeholders will represent themselves through the engagement process* – but rather to provide guidance and direction throughout the process to ensure that it aligns with the process design and stakeholder expectations. Their role is to oversee the integrity of the process and react to changes along the way.



Ideally this **Process Accountability Team** will consist of 7-12 individuals, each of whom has the following recognized characteristics:

- Trusted by key stakeholders
- Broad knowledge related to the system, common timelines, and key stakeholders
- Deep appreciation for the needs of this particular process and the reasons for its design
- The ability to commit sufficient time to:
 - Participate in most if not all process convenings through the end of 2012
 - Meet regularly as a group with project consultants into the first quarter of 2013
 - Comfortably participate in person, via teleconference, and electronically as necessary
 - Review documents and respond with limited turnaround time
- Positive commitment to the revised Blueprint 2 process and its potential
- Demonstrated ability to focus explicitly on the process and overall outcomes

The process for convening the Process Accountability Team is proposed to proceed as follows:

- Disseminate the team description and desired characteristics among key stakeholders
- Invite nominations by a date certain – to be submitted to CHIP
- Assuming the number nominated is within the ideal team size, share the list of nominations within the community for comment by a date certain
- If the number nominated is too few or too many, CHIP will inform stakeholders of the situation and adjust per consensus.

3.3 Preliminary Design Framework

The planning and engagement processes still require a great deal of work before they are ready to be shared with stakeholders. Even then, to be properly responsive they must remain flexible around timing, depth/breadth in any given area, and the content of the Stakeholder Engagement Plan. The framework below presents inputs and outputs that have either been requested to date or are otherwise necessary for a successful process. The details will be developed collaboratively as the implementation evolves.

What	Why / To What End	How
Preparation (June 2012)		
Clear and timely decisions, communications, and well-designed and run opportunities to participate are central to this startup and include the following.		
1. Define Structure and Agreement with Consultants a. Put project and process structure, agreements, protocols in place with broad timeline for activities and deliverables, and communications approach	This set of tasks ensures that key stakeholders and others involved in these issues understand the principles and commitments embedded in the overall project, everyone’s roles, and trust the opportunity to be engaged.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The existing selection committee chooses a consulting team or other means of accomplishing the rest of the project
2. Establish and Charge Process Accountability Team b. Implement Process Accountability Team approach to process stewardship, oversight, and monitoring		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nominate and agree upon members of the Process Accountability Team based on job description discussed beginning in April workshops
3. Finalize Communications Agreements (ongoing) a. Ensure appropriate, timely, detailed access to information for stakeholders throughout the process b. Demonstrate transparency / inclusiveness by communicating with and engaging stakeholders in multiple ways early and often		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build a simple and highly accessible project website/portal, refine, and populate it in consultation with stakeholders (WordPress or similar user-friendly platform) • Communicate the planning process and tentative timeline with stakeholders and revise in a timely fashion • Develop an approach for media engagement and authorizer updates throughout and revise regularly in consultation with the Process Accountability Team • Regularly communicate with <u>all</u> stakeholders, provide tools for them to use in communicating with boards of directors, and share results of <u>all</u> activities widely
4. Ensure Engagement Capacity a. Support stakeholder capacity to co-facilitate/document information gathering and stakeholder engagement processes		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop training, guidelines, and protocols for stakeholders to expand and deepen authentic engagement opportunities through the Stakeholder Engagement Plan, while ensuring overall process alignment and staying flexible • Conduct one or more training events
Information Gathering and Creating Meaning (June – August 2012)		
All activity from this point forward will be managed by the consultants and implemented in collaboration with stakeholders and in consultation with the Process Accountability Team. Gathering, analyzing, and sharing this information then developing a common understanding of its meaning honors stakeholders’ “stake” in this work.		

What	Why / To What End	How
<p>5. Conduct Baseline Research and Analysis (asset mapping)</p> <p>a. Complete needs assessment and gaps analysis related to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Assessment of people and their needs 2) Current program/service inventory 3) Relevant trends (e.g., population numbers over time) <p>b. Collect regional and national examples of systems, resources, and structures</p> <p>c. Collect information regarding current funding sources; constraints, priorities, and decision-making process; and future opportunities</p>	<p>This work:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addresses specific requests of stakeholders for the process • Meets common-sense needs for solid information • Sets the stage for meeting regulatory requirements to gather and maintain a comprehensive and current database for the community’s entire continuum of care for people experiencing homelessness. 	<p>[See Stakeholder Engagement Plan for more detail]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [a] Refine content and questions relevant to these tasks • Identify subset of stakeholders relevant to these tasks and develop, verify, and develop detailed contact information • Build database frame; prepare draft data-gathering template, pilot, and finalize it (for the breadth and depth required here, “crowd-sourcing” with relevant stakeholders will be the most effective and efficient starting point for this activity) • Gather input from stakeholders; Process Accountability Team and others • Process, analyze, share, and gather additional stakeholder input as needed • Refine results and set up for regular updating • [b] Gather information on systems, resources, and structures from comparable communities around the country • [c] Though some of this may fit with crowdsourcing above, this may require small group meetings or interviews.
<p>6. Create Meaning</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Draw conclusions from research and analysis results b. Map current “system” structure with strengths and weaknesses c. Identify key successes of Blueprint 1 and productive initiatives already in motion d. Extract lessons from Blueprint 1 evaluation e. Explore experiences of other models / locations f. Understand funding landscape 	<p>This work ensures a common understanding of current positions as well as a foundation from which stakeholders can make critical decisions, and provides context for Blueprint goals and strategies.</p>	<p>[See Stakeholder Engagement Plan for more detail]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial “cuts” for this work may be best done in facilitated small group settings (e.g., to examine system issues) • Convene the stakeholder community to present, discuss, and understand information gathered and conclusions drawn • Identify critical issues and preferred models for the Blueprint as well as key messages from the data • Summarize and share widely
<p>Preliminary Goal-Setting (July – August 2012)</p>		
<p>These complex and consequential decisions require dedicated, focused, and collaborative in-person time. They also require a “light touch” in their first iteration, recognizing that subsequent steps may require an iterative process that returns to these big picture decisions for adjustment.</p>		
<p>7. Set Goals</p> <p>Make key “framing” decisions for the Blueprint, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Purpose for the Blueprint b. Timeframe for implementation 	<p>This essential step brings stakeholders together to make well-informed and serious decisions about the long-term and big picture.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convene the stakeholder community for a full day to make these decisions • Develop opportunities for stakeholders to offer ideas and input on these topics – ensuring that all participants are fully informed around the research and analysis results – and fully incorporate input of those unable to attend • Compile results, provide/present results to stakeholders to review, refine, and accept

What	Why / To What End	How
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. Vision for the future d. Goals for success including measurable outcomes (expected and stretch) e. Key priorities driving decisions going forward 		<p>[This would be appropriate for very broad community involvement – e.g., town hall meeting – and may require specific follow-up with some stakeholders.]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finalize and share widely
<p>Confirming Goals and Prioritizing Strategies <i>(August – October 2012)</i></p> <p>As with the vision and goals, this deep work takes extensive in-person time that is deeply informed by input from stakeholders unable to attend. Developed with stakeholders and supported by the Process Accountability Team, activities are likely to include the following.</p>		
<p>8. Explore Options</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Ensure adequate exploration of ideas/options that could become strategies, tactics, system changes, collaborations, operational models, etc., in the new Blueprint 	<p>Bringing together guidance from Phase 1 with baseline and trend results plus the agreed-upon vision, goals, and top priorities, stakeholders are ready to make critical strategy decisions.</p> <p>These will address the full range of issues and topics identified to date.</p>	<p>[See Stakeholder Engagement Plan for more information]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop opportunities for stakeholders to offer ideas and input on these topics – tightly linked to Phase 1 guidance, research and analysis results, and the Blueprint vision/ goals/ priorities results • Consider appropriateness of town hall meeting, targeted public convenings, and/or editorials around specific topics to engage Indianapolis in the dialogue
<p>1. Formulate Preliminary Strategies</p> <p>Select and develop key strategies around:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Best practices, innovation b. Strategies/activities that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are actionable and fundable • Logically and sequentially support goals and priorities • Include system change (e.g., new funding streams) and advocacy efforts as appropriate • Tangible, measurable in a pre-defined way 	<p>This work carefully navigates the delicate balance between the reality of current challenges and the crucial commitments that underlie the vision, goals, and key priorities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convene the stakeholder community for a full day to make these decisions; fully incorporate input from those unable to attend • Develop logic model or map linking preliminary strategies to goals in logical, sequential way that identifies gaps, duplication, that may interfere with long-term success • Compile results and provide/present results to stakeholders for further input [this would be appropriate for very broad community involvement and may also require specific follow-up with some stakeholders.]
<p>9. Vet and Revisit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Ensure key strategies are vetted and input fully considered before finalizing b. Revisit “framing” decisions as necessary to finalize 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and implement vetting process as necessary to ensure viability of preferred strategies, fill logic gaps, generate endorsements prior to finalizing structure [Note that this portion of the work cannot be defined until there is a short list of strategies with desired outcomes and logical linkages to work from.] • Convene the stakeholder community for a half day to review results of vetting

What	Why / To What End	How
		<p>process, refine results, and revisit decisions as necessary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Finalize and share widely
<p>Operationalizing Work <i>(November – December 2012)</i></p>		
<p>Much of the content should have emerged in concept through the strategy vetting process but will need additional work to align efforts and fill in gaps. In particular, systems such as evaluation should be discussed away from strategies and to ensure their adequacy. The depth of this work will depend in part on the purpose of the Blueprint 2 as a document as compared with development of ongoing / annual work plans as part of implementation, however, it should at least include the items below.</p>		
<p>2. Determine Systems Design/Structure</p> <p>Develop key implementation systems, approaches and models:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A template for itemizing and monitoring action and progress Role, responsibility and accountability structures for each strategy, goal and/or the work as a whole Evaluation approach, including periodic review and revision process for strategies, goals and/or the work as a whole Resource models for accomplishing the work through funding, collaboration, resource optimization, system savings, etc. Information, data/collection, communication, marketing systems to best support vision, goals, and key strategies; roles of convening, advocacy, and other entities System structure/design to best support vision, goals, and key strategies; roles of convening, advocacy, and other entities 	<p>This final formal step brings everything together into the most appropriate form to both drive and fully support successful action on the strategies toward the goals and vision.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> “Initial cuts” for some of this work may be best done in facilitated small group settings (e.g., action template and evaluation approach) Convene the stakeholder community to present, discuss, and understand “initial cut” work and agree on larger items (e.g., accountability structure / body) Summarize and share widely
<p>Production and Rollout <i>(January – February 2013)</i></p>		
<p>Rolling out the plan will require continuous engagement with stakeholders, authorizers, and the public throughout the process.</p>		
<p>10. Produce Document</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Develop formal document for publication, including online <p>11. Secure Endorsements and Manage Soft Rollout</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Secure formal endorsements for inclusion in the document Roll out content in small meetings as appropriate <p>12. Host Community Rollout Celebration</p>	<p>Complete commitment to community to finish and roll out a community-driven and community-based plan</p>	

Section 4: Stakeholder Engagement Plan

This comprehensive draft combines results from the two April 2012 workshops with stakeholders. *Its completion requires further input from stakeholders, who will be central to its implementation over the subsequent phases.*

Stakeholder and "Stake"	Key Questions	Purpose	Barriers	Tools, activities	Contacts	Responsibility	Week	Status	
Providers									
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who do you serve and in what way? What are their unique needs? What are the restrictions or limitations for your programs and services? What is your program capacity? What are your funding sources? • What strategies yield the most successful outcomes for your clients? For whom/what? What data/collection systems do you have? What kinds of evaluation do you do? • What are the barriers that prevent you from better serving clients? • In what ways are you or could you collaborate in order to improve outcomes for those you serve? In what ways are those formalized? What has and hasn't worked? Where are there duplications? In what ways are you unique? • What different resources are necessary to improve outcomes? • What programs/service gaps to you see? How do you know? • What are the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats to the programs and services you offer? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vision, goals, key priorities • Baseline program/service inventory • Gaps analysis • Funding inventory • Evaluation, outcomes, best practices, innovation • Fundable strategies • Role of advocacy in the Blueprint 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<p>These will vary by question and timing within Phase 2.</p> <p>Research/inventory, systems content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder-run sessions and surveys within own organizations or including partners • Selected small-group sessions (system) • Online tools <p>Trends, scenarios, changes, options, etc.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitated large-group sessions • Selected small-group sessions • Online tools 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

	Stakeholder and "Stake"	Key Questions	Purpose	Barriers	Tools, activities	Contacts	Responsibility	Week	Status
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the role of advocacy in ending homelessness? • What does a full "continuum of care" in Indianapolis mean to you? Where is the community strong? Where is it weak? • Who is not being served or not being served well by anyone? Why not? How do you know? 							
13.	Activist providers: (list below) Stake:	•	•	•	•		•		•
14.	Providers: (list below) Stake:	•	•	•	•		•		•
15.	Permanent supportive housing providers (list below) Stake:	•	•	•	•		•		•
Government Agencies									
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are your priorities and goals around homelessness? • What are your policies and administrative strategies related to homelessness? • What role does your organization currently play in reducing/ending homelessness? How do you envision your role in the future? • What resources do you provide related to homelessness? What are the sources? • What are the primary objectives of these expenditures? • What are the barriers or restrictions on the resources you provide? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding • Vision, goals, key priorities • Efficiencies 	•	These will vary by question and timing within Phase 2. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitated cross-entity group sessions • Small-group sessions or interviews as necessary to fill in gaps • Online tools 		•		•

	Stakeholder and "Stake"	Key Questions	Purpose	Barriers	Tools, activities	Contacts	Responsibility	Week	Status
16.	Indianapolis Department of Metropolitan Development: <i>Community/Economic Development and Neighborhoods</i> <i>Stake:</i>	•	•	•	•	Julie, Erika, Jenny F, Maury	•		•
17.	Indianapolis Housing Agency <i>Stake:</i>	•	•	•	•		•		•
18.	Marion County Mental Health Court <i>Stake:</i>	•	•	•	•	Hon. Barbara Collins	•		•
19.	Indianapolis Metropolitan Police Homeless Outreach Unit <i>Stake:</i>	•	•	•	•	Sgt Hipple	•		•
20.	Indiana Department of Corrections, Homeless Probation Team <i>Stake:</i>	•	•	•	•	ask Brianna Sauer	•		•
21.	HUD regional staff (McKinney-Vento funds) <i>Stake:</i>	•	•	•	•	John Dorgan	•		•
22.	Continuum of Care Advisory Board (CoCAB) <i>Stake:</i>	•	•	•	•		•		•
23.	McKinney-Vento liaisons at area school districts <i>Stake:</i>	•	•	•	•	(See list from Christina Davis)	•		•
24.	Center Township Trustee Homeless Team (is this the correct name?) <i>Stake:</i>	•	•	•	•		•		•
25.	Neighboring cities • Lawrence • Speedway • Southport	•	•	•	•		•		•

	Stakeholder and "Stake"	Key Questions	Purpose	Barriers	Tools, activities	Contacts	Responsibility	Week	Status
	• Beech Grove <i>Stake:</i>								
Elected Officials									
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are your priorities, goals, and policies around homelessness? • What role does your elected body currently play in reducing/ending homelessness? How do you envision your role in the future? • What political and community barriers do you face in preventing and helping end homelessness? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vision and goals • Gaps analysis and system structure/design • Key priorities 	•	These will vary by question and timing within Phase 2. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Selected small-group sessions or interviews • Online tools 		•		•
26.	City-County Council Chair <i>Stake:</i>	•	•	•	•	Maggie Lewis	•		•
27.	City-County Council <i>Stake:</i>	•	•	•	•		•		•
28.	Mayor's Office <i>Stake:</i>	•	•	•	•		•		•
29.	Warren Township Trustee <i>Stake:</i>	•	•	•	•	Jeff Bennet	•		•
30.	Lawrence Township Trustee <i>Stake:</i>	•	•	•	•	Russell Brown	•		•
Funders									
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are your primary concerns related to preventing and ending homelessness? What requests aren't you seeing or needs aren't being addressed? • What are your current funding priorities around homelessness? What are your future plans in this arena? What might change those priorities/ plans? • What lessons have you learned about 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vision and goals • Funding needs/requests • Funding opportunities • Gaps analysis and system structure/design • Key priorities 	•	These will vary by question and timing within Phase 2. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitated cross-entity group sessions • Selected small-group sessions or 		•		•

	Stakeholder and "Stake"	Key Questions	Purpose	Barriers	Tools, activities	Contacts	Responsibility	Week	Status
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> what does and doesn't work around homelessness? • What outcomes do you expect for your funding? • What are your decision-making criteria for funding? How important are things like the population served, collaboration, specific programs or services, evaluation / outcomes, etc.? • What opportunities exist to better align actual needs, program/services, and funding to more effectively improve outcomes? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation, outcomes, best practice 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> interviews • Online tools 				
31.	Nina Mason Pulliam Charitable Trust <i>Stake:</i>	•	•	•	•	Michael T	•		•
32.	Central Indiana Community Foundation <i>Stake:</i>	•	•	•	•	Tara Seely	•		•
33.	Indianapolis Foundation at CICF <i>Stake:</i>	•	•	•	•	Angie C	•		•
34.	Family Funds at CICF <i>Stake:</i>	•	•	•	•		•		•
35.	United Way of Central Indiana <i>Stake:</i>	•	•	•	•	Mary Jones, Christi Gillespie, Michelle Beer	•		•
36.	Lilly Endowment <i>Stake:</i>	•	•	•	•	Chuck Preston	•		•
37.	Corporation for Supportive Housing <i>Stake:</i>	•	•	•	•	Lori Phillips-Steele	•		•

	Stakeholder and "Stake"	Key Questions	Purpose	Barriers	Tools, activities	Contacts	Responsibility	Week	Status
38.	Metropolitan Indianapolis Board of Realtors <i>Stake: Provide some funding for emergency, transitional, and permanent supportive housing</i>	•	•	•	•		•		•
39.	Indianapolis Housing Trust Fund Committee (Department of Metropolitan Development) <i>Stake:</i>	•	•	•	•		•		•
40.	Indiana Department of Family Social Services <i>Stake:</i>	•	•	•	•		•		•
41.	Indiana Housing and Community Development Authority <i>Stake:</i>	•	•	•	•	Rodney Stockment	•		•
People Experiencing Homelessness									
42.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Families • Singles • Youth/teens • Domestic violence • Re-entry • Vets • Chronic • Disabled • Substance abuse • Mental health • Without a qualifying disability <i>Stake:</i>	• TBD related to their experiences and needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vision, goals • Needs, gaps • Trends • System/structure • Best practices 	•	These will vary by question and timing within Phase 2. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provider/ outreach/ advocate-facilitated small group sessions 	To be reached through providers, including those doing street outreach	•		•
Advocates									
		• TBD; likely some combination of the	• Vision and goals	•	These will vary by		•		•

	Stakeholder and "Stake"	Key Questions	Purpose	Barriers	Tools, activities	Contacts	Responsibility	Week	Status
		questions asked of other stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding needs/requests • Funding opportunities • Gaps analysis and system structure/design • Key priorities • Evaluation, outcomes, best practice 		question and timing within Phase 2. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitated cross-entity group sessions • Online tools 				
43.	Domestic Violence Network (DVN) <i>Stake:</i>	•	•	•	•		•		•
44.	Advocacy Council (CHIP) <i>Stake:</i>	•	•	•	•		•		•
45.	Coordinated Community Response to Homelessness (CCRH) <i>Stake:</i>	•	•	•	•		•		•
46.	KEY Consumer Organization <i>Stake:</i>	•	•	•	•	Ronda Ames	•		•
47.	CHIP <i>Stake:</i>	•	•	•	•		•		•
Partners									
		• TBD; likely some combination of the questions asked of other stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vision and goals • Funding opportunities • Gaps analysis and system structure/design • Key priorities • Evaluation, outcomes, best practice 	•	These will vary by question and timing within Phase 2. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitated cross-entity group sessions, which may be the same as those for • Online tools 		•		•
48.	IUPUI School of Public Affairs and School of Social Work	•	•	•	•		•		•

	Stakeholder and "Stake"	Key Questions	Purpose	Barriers	Tools, activities	Contacts	Responsibility	Week	Status
	<i>Stake:</i>								
49.	VA Homeless Veteran's Team <i>Stake:</i>	•	•	•	•		•		•
50.	Indianapolis Coalition for Neighborhood Development (with Indiana Association for Community Economic Development) <i>Stake:</i>	•	•	•	•		•		•
Resources									
		• TBD; likely some combination of the questions asked of other stakeholders	• Vision and goals • Funding opportunities • Gaps analysis and system structure/design • Key priorities • Evaluation, outcomes, best practice	•	•		•		•
51.	Access to Recovery <i>Stake:</i>	•	•	•	•		•		•
52.	Wishard Hospital and outpatient clinic <i>Stake:</i>	•	•	•	•		•		•
53.	Community Centers of Indianapolis <i>Stake:</i>	•	•	•	•		•		•
54.	Health and Hospital Corporation <i>Stake: Provide funding for Housing Trust Fund to create affordable housing</i>	•	•	•	•	Dan Sellers	•		•
55.	Trusted Mentors <i>Stake:</i>	•	•	•	•		•		•
56.	Indiana Council of Community	•	•	•	•		•		•

	Stakeholder and "Stake"	Key Questions	Purpose	Barriers	Tools, activities	Contacts	Responsibility	Week	Status
	Mental Health Centers (<i>trade association</i>) <i>Stake:</i>								
57.	Recycle Force <i>Stake:</i>	•	•	•	•		•		•
58.	Employ Indy <i>Stake:</i>	•	•	•	•	Evelyn Ridley-Turner	•		•
59.	Marion County Health Department <i>Stake:</i>	•	•	•	•		•		•
60.	Department of Children's Services <i>Stake:</i>	•	•	•	•	Jennifer Huber	•		•
61.	Community Court (<i>for downtown homeless</i>) <i>Stake:</i>	•	•	•	•	Hon. David Certo	•		•
62.	Indianapolis Downtown Inc. <i>Stake:</i>	•	•	•	•		•		•
Uncategorized									
63.	Substance abuse group <i>Stake:</i>	•	•	•	•	ask Sharon	•		•
64.		•	•	•	•		•		•
65.		•	•	•	•		•		•
66.		•	•	•	•		•		•
67.		•	•	•	•		•		•

4.1 Providers to Engage (plus others to be identified)

Key: For type of shelter, 1=Yes; other cell #s indicate capacity

Provider	Type of Shelter			Population / # Beds			Service Level			Contact
	Shelter	Transitional	Perm Supp	Singles	Families-children	Youth	Housing only	Housing + services	Services only	
Adult and Child Mental Health Center										
Coburn Place / Safe Haven										
Dayspring Family Shelter										
Genessaret Free Clinics										
Harbor Light										
Healthnet HIP Medical										
Holy Family Shelter										
Homeless Initiative Program (HIP)										
Homeless Veterans Assistance Foundation (HVAF)										
Horizon House										
IU Medical Group at Horizon House										
Interfaith Hospitality Network										
Julian Center										
Midtown Mental Health Services (Wishard)										
Outreach, Inc.										
Partners in Housing										
The Pourhouse										
Salvation Army Social Service Center										
Stopover, Inc.										
Street Reach Homeless Ministry										
Tear Down the Walls Homeless Ministry										
Wheeler Mission Men's Shelter										
Wheeler Mission Women and Children's Shelter										

4.2 Information-Only Stakeholders

In addition to the stakeholders who we will target for specific input, we will regularly communicate with the following stakeholders and welcome their input at any of various public sessions during the Blueprint 2 development process.

- Indiana Apartment Association
- Bethlehem House
- Central Indiana Community Mental Health Network (*is this correct?*)
- Church Federation of Greater Indianapolis (Dr. Angelique Walker-Smith)
- Connected by 25
- Community Reinvestment Act officers at local banks (list)
- Craine House (*residential work-release program for women with pre-school age children*)
- Fairbanks Substance Abuse
- Faith-based organizations (list)
- Gallahue Mental Health
- Greater Indianapolis Progress Committee
- HHOOT (Helpers Helping Others Outreach Team) / Homeless and Reentry Helpers, Inc.
- Indiana Department of Corrections: P.E.N. Products (*how are they a stakeholder for the Blueprint development process?*)
- Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce
- Indianapolis Cole-Noble District Neighborhood Association
- Indianapolis Neighborhood Housing Partnership
- Indianapolis Neighborhood Resource Center
- Indianapolis Holy Cross Neighborhood Association
- Indianapolis Irish Hill Neighborhood Association
- Indianapolis Public Library
- Indianapolis Public Safety Department
- IndyGo: Indianapolis Public Transportation Corporation (Michael Terry)
- Lilly Foundation (Willis Bright)
- Key detox centers (list)
- Key emergency rooms (list)
- Marion County legislative delegation
- Marion County Sheriff's Department
- NAMI Indianapolis (Ed Alexander)
- Safe Families (Diane Palma)
- Township trustees (other than Center, Warren, Laurence)

Section 5: Appendix

5.1 Blueprint 2 Stakeholder Identification and Analysis Workshop Overview

Blueprint 2 Stakeholder Identification and Analysis Workshop Workshop Overview and Prep Materials

Thursday 19 April 2012, 1-5 pm (arrive early) – American Red Cross

At this workshop, participants will identify and analyze the stakeholders who are most relevant to the work of developing the 2012 Blueprint 2. The task for the day is to answer this question:

Who are the individuals and organizations that have a stake/interest in, or power over, how we prevent and end homelessness in the Indianapolis area?

The results will drive the stakeholder engagement and planning process design and implementation.

We will use a straightforward process that is highly participatory and yields clear and useful results. Everyone will be actively involved throughout the workshop, contributing ideas, insights, and perspectives to reach consensus on these stakeholders.

For the purposes of this workshop, we are using this definition: *a stakeholder is an individual or group that can make a claim on the attention, resources, or output of the Blueprint 2 effort, or is affected by its work or activities.*



It is also important to realize that this stakeholder identification and analysis work is explicitly an interim step. We will be looking at stakeholders as they are *now*, but our work with these stakeholders will change that landscape as we move through the process. Thus the results of this workshop give us the *starting point* to transparently and responsibly develop a robust stakeholder engagement plan to support the 2012 Blueprint 2.

Logistics: We will start at 1:00, so please arrive early. Dress comfortably, as we'll be moving around a lot.

Homework: Start thinking about stakeholders in response to the question above, and feel free to bring names with you. We will do the work together, however, so this is optional but helps “grease your wheels.”

Parking: The chapter has a large parking lot

Directions: <http://www.redcross-indy.org/Contact/Map.aspx>

Thank you in advance to those of you who can attend the workshop.

Questions: If you have any questions, please contact Michael Butler, mbutler@chipindy.org, 317-472-7637.

5.2 Process and Document Recommendations from 2011 Blueprint 2 Draft Release

The community engagement design consultants prepared this summary for use in the workshop on 20 April 2012

Preplanning Preparation

- **Participants:** Ensure well-regarded local experts in the field are invited to participate on the steering committee; include a broader group of professionals working in a variety of roles and at various levels within organizations.
- **Models:** Learn from recent – successful – community planning efforts in designing a process such as:
 - *Greater Indianapolis Neighborhood Initiative (LISC)*
 - Inclusive: any one could participate via listening sessions
 - Discipline: goals were concrete and specific, tied to outcomes and time frames so that implementers had clear guidance and accountability
 - *Department of Metropolitan Development Neighborhood Stabilization Plan*
 - Excellent use of data to drive community decision-making
- **Assessment:** Conduct a comprehensive evaluation of consumers to see if we are meeting their needs.

The Planning Process

- **Transparency:** Ensure that the planning process, plan for engaging the community into the process, and the roles of individuals and organizations in plan development are well communicated throughout so that all understand when to participate and how their input will be used.
- **Blueprint 1 Evaluation:** Use results of the evaluation as a basis for developing the next set of strategies. Specifically, digest evaluation before identifying strategies; solicit feedback from service providers, clients, or the community-at-large; and develop consensus around the accuracy and/or meaning of its findings.
- **Time for Deliberation:** Allow sufficient time for deliberation throughout.
 - Publish draft work in advance of meetings.
 - Offer time to carefully consider the finer details of what should be included with ample discussion and input.
 - Recall that the first Blueprint required five drafts before release.
- **Actionable Strategies:** Ensure ideas that emerge in inclusive brainstorming are actionable, that actionable ideas are achievable, and that achievable strategies are advisable.
 - *Specific / Intentional:* Fully vet all brainstorming before selecting Blueprint strategies. Explore and gather/share data supporting their need and achievability, set specific measurable goals and timelines, and define roles for implementation.
 - *Contextualized / Supported:* Link all to:
 - Lessons learned from the original Blueprint and its evaluation (including successes to build upon);
 - Need data, including how that need has changed;
 - Measurable goals and returns to the community for gains achieved; and
 - Clear demonstration that the process has vetted its potential for success.
- **No Surprises:** Ensure appropriate organizational consultation and support of key strategies prior to release.

Plan Document

- **Tone:** Ensure the text is professional in tone attending particularly to language that might be editorial or open to misunderstanding (e.g., lack of services that actually exist or authority to act where it does not) so that it is a document implementers can use to build support.
- **Voice:** Voice as the collective work of an inclusive community rather than demands or ideas sent to others.
- **Style:** Design the document to balance text, data, and image with a “person on the street” editorial eye.
- **Definition:** Make liberal use of definitions to ensure the broadest understanding of the document.
- **Structure:** Incorporate the results of process recommendations (above) into the structure of the document.

5.3 IAP2's Public Participation Spectrum

IAP2's Public Participation Spectrum



	Inform	Consult	Involve	Collaborate	Empower
Public participation goal	To provide the public with balanced and objective information to assist them in understanding the problem, alternatives, opportunities and/or solutions.	To obtain public feedback on analysis, alternatives and/or decisions.	To work directly with the public throughout the process to ensure that public concerns and aspirations are consistently understood and considered.	To partner with the public in each aspect of the decision including the development of alternatives and the identification of the preferred solution.	To place final decision-making in the hands of the public.
Promise to the public	We will keep you informed.	We will keep you informed, listen to and acknowledge concerns and aspirations, and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision.	We will work with you to ensure that your concerns and aspirations are directly reflected in the alternatives developed and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision.	We will look to you for advice and innovation in formulating solutions and incorporate your advice and recommendations into the decisions to the maximum extent possible.	We will implement what you decide.
Example techniques	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Fact sheets ■ Web sites ■ Open houses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Public comment ■ Focus groups ■ Surveys ■ Public meetings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Workshops ■ Deliberative polling 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Citizen advisory Committees ■ Consensus-building ■ Participatory decision-making 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Citizen juries ■ Ballots ■ Delegated decision

IAP2 Core Values

- Public participation is based on the belief that those who are affected by a decision have a right to be involved in the decision-making process.
- Public participation includes the promise that the public's contribution will influence the decision.
- Public participation promotes sustainable decisions by recognizing and communicating the needs and interests of all participants, including decision makers.
- Public participation seeks out and facilitates the involvement of those potentially affected by or interested in a decision.
- Public participation seeks input from participants in designing how they participate.
- Public participation provides participants with the information they need to participate in a meaningful way.
- Public participation communicates to participants how their input affected the decision.

© 2000-2006