Scorecard Committee Meeting #2

May 5, 2022

Attendees: Allie Card, Brian Alexander, Laurel McNamee, Adriana Diaz, Timothy Rogers, Phoenix Hinson, Alicia Broadway, Bonnie Harper, Robin Wintringham, Joel Rice, Kimberly Ledford, Angela Harper King, Jane Earnest, Lori Watts, Cara Moraitis

- Using the previous year's NOFO to inform scorecards, helps be more alignment with HUD priorities
- Minor changes include formatting and word changes

2022 Scorecard for CoC Funds: Renewal Projects
- 2nd page
  - Updated point totals for project quality requirements: CoC's received maximum points if at least 33% of all points were for objective measures and 20% were for System Performance Measures
  - NOFO could change the percentage this year, but CoC will likely meet the minimum regardless; if it does not the Scorecard Committee will meet again
- Section 1: Program Requirements
  - Minor adjustment of language
- Section 2: Program Design
  - Reworked section for clarity in scoring
    - Housing First: added language so applicants know that the added listed sections are below question 2.1a, questions 2.1b and 2.1c are more specific in their language
    - Historically these questions have been confusing for applicants so the goal is to make them as clear as possible
    - Timothy Rogers made a suggestion to change "Not sobriety" in question 2.1c for Housing First requirements
      - Bonnie Harper and Angela Harper King suggested changing sobriety to recovery.
      - The phrase was changed to "Failure to maintain recovery"
  - For the Permanent Supportive Housing and Rapid Re-Housing Performance Benchmarks and Program Standards sections, instructions were provided to help scorers.
  - For the PSH and RRH: Services Resource Leverage Plan section, language was added to be more precise about how applicants will be evaluated ("specifically").
    - Wanted to make sure applicants understood this section was for specific funding for specific projects

- - For the Permanent Supportive Housing: Moving-on Strategy section, the instructions were moved to match the document formatting and ensure applicants do not overlook them.
  - Section 3: Equity
    - Specifically looked at by Racial Equity Subcommittee, which compared it to last year's section and made adjustments.
    - Went from 20 possible points last year to 29 this year. The minimum points required went from 11 to 16.
      - Questions 3.1, 3.2, 3.3: adjusted points from 4 to 5
      - Question 3.4 added language for clarity
      - Question 3.5 changed from possible points to a standard that is met or unmet.
        - Changed because it is in the CoC's Anti-Discrimination policy as a requirement, so it should be in agencies' policies.
      - Question 3.6 created a lot of confusion last year. Examples of attendance to racial equity or anti-discrimination trainings were added to clarify what is meant by "external training" and that attending NCCEH events is not the same as seeking training for your staff. The number of possible points increased from 3 to 5.
      - Question 3.7 possible points changed from 1 to 2.
      - Question 3.8 is a new addition and asks, "[For nonprofit agencies only] Do individuals that are BIPOC comprise at least 20% of your Board of Directors?"
        - Agencies receiving public funds must have at least 1 person with lived experience of homelessness on their board.
        - Answer choices are 20% or above and less than 20%
      - Question 3.9 is a new addition and asks, "[For nonprofit agencies only] How many members of your Board of Directors have experienced homelessness?
        - Answer choices are 3 or more and less than 3
        - Answer choices were changed to 20% or above and less than 20%
      - Question 3.10 is a new addition and asks, "What percent of managers or director-level positions are BIPOC?"
        - Answer choices are 20% or above and less than 20%
        - Angela Harper King suggested added an option for 10-20%
          - Helps break it down and establish a baseline for gauging percentages
        - Answer choice of between 10-20% was added, and less than 20% was changed to 10%
  - Kristen Dunn asked about question 3.2 regarding client-facing bilingual staff, and if that has to be specific to housing programs having bilingual staff or if bilingual staff can just be an employee within the agency. Laurel answered that an applicant would still be awarded points even if the employee is not working the program being applied for,

because even if their role is not housing-focused, they may come with a skill set that can be utilized in helping clients or bringing a new perspective to the agency.

- ○ Bonnie Harper suggested that the word "contract" within question 3.2 be changed to avoid applicants thinking they need to provide a formal contract, and "agreement" was changed to "form of documentation"
- ○ Brian suggested changing the question to "Does the applicant have an agreement for interpreter services?" and for instructions, "Provide an MOA/MOU or other form of documentation with interpreter service"
- ○ Robin suggested changing "agreement" to "arrangement". The question was changed to "Does the applicant have an arrangement for interpreter services?"

- ● Section 4: Project Performance
  - ○ 4.1a: Above 50% answer choice - possible points changed to 15% to reflect the CoC's priority to serve the most vulnerable.
  - ○ 4.1b: Proposing removing this question to make room for system performance measures
  - ○ 4.1c: Slight language modifications for clarification
  - ○ 4.1d: Increased possible points to incentivize moving on strategies
  - ○ 4.1f: Removing question
  - ○ 4.1g: Increasing points as it is a system performance measure
  - ○ 4.1i: Increasing points as it is a system performance measure
  - ○ 4.1j: Increasing points as it is a system performance measure
  - ○ 4.1k: Increasing points as it is a system performance measure
  - ○ 2 questions added as SPMs to measure the program's returns to homelessness after exit (4.1l and 4.1m) - 4.1l to PSH and 4.1m related to RRH
  - ○ 4.2a: Changed reports being looked at (APR instead of Data Quality Report)
  - ○ 4.2b: added comparable database because VSPs are prohibited from using HMIS and must use a comparable database
  - ○ 4.3c: removing question, not relevant
- ● Section 5: Coordinated Entry and Prioritization
  - ○ 5.2: removing question, doesn't line up with current practices
  - ○ 5.3: renamed report and adjusted points as referrals should all come from CE system, added "exception for VSPs"
  - ○ 5.4: removing question as CE handles this
- ● Section 6: application deadlines and documentation
  - ○ No changes

2022 Scorecard for CoC Funds: New Projects - overall similar changes to renewal project scorecard changes
- ● Updated point totals for project quality requirements: CoC's received maximum points if at least 33% of all points were for objective measures and 20% were for System Performance Measures
- ● Section 1: minor language adjustments, changed answer choices - similar to renewal project scorecard changes

- Section 2: minor language changes - similar to renewal project scorecard changes
  - Removed question 2.2b as CE handles this
  - Changing 2.4 answer choices to match renewal scorecard
- Section 3
  - 3.2 and 3.3 increased possible points from 3 to 5
- Section 4: exactly the same as it is in the renewal scorecard
- Section 5: organizational capacity (different from renewal scorecard section 5), minor language changes
  - 5.8 changed wording since it is a SPM so it can be measured well
- Section 6: project performance, points adjusted
  - 6.1b: changed report
  - 6.1c: removing question
  - 6.1e is now system performance measure but possible points haven't changed
  - 6.1g: system performance measure and points increased
  - 6.1h: system performance measure and points increased
  - 6.1i: system performance measure and points increased
  - 6.1j: removing question
  - 6.1k: system performance measure and points increased
  - Spending rate information same as in renewal project scorecard
  - 6.3c: removing question
- Section 7: agency's relationship to community
  - 6.3: points reduced from 10 to 5
- Section 8: application deadlines and documentation
  - No changes

Timothy Rogers moved to approve the 2022 New and Renewal BoS CoC Scorecard recommendations and Jane Earnest seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously. The recommendations will be presented to the BoS CoC Steering Committee on June 7 for approval.

The third Scorecard Committee has been canceled.