



North Carolina Balance of State Continuum of Care

bos@ncceh.org

919.755.4393

www.ncceh.org/BoS

BoS Scorecard Committee Meeting 6.7.17

Attendance

Committee Members: Monica Frizzell, Kristen Martin, Tonette Latham, Reeshema Walker, Michele Knapp, Candice Rountree

NCCEH Staff: Brian Alexander, Ehren Dohler, Nancy Holochwost

Background

- Prior to the meeting, committee members were provided with copies of the draft new and renewal scorecards that included proposed changes.
- Intentions of the proposed changes are to:
 - Make the scorecard cleaner and easier to use for Project Review Committee
 - Update and clarify any wording that was confusing to Project Review Committee members last year
 - Make clear to grantees what the CoC's expectations and priorities are
 - Ensure scorecards prioritize the projects that will be the most effective and have the best outcomes for the people they serve
 - Add references to the Funding Priorities Workgroup's recommendations
 - Update point totals (based on new or revised questions)
 - Update section titles to reflect the questions in those sections
- BoS staff and committee members reviewed the proposed changes in detail.

Review of Renewal Scorecard Proposed Changes

- Goals Section
 - Added references to funding priorities document, written standards, and CoC grantee agreements
 - Kristen asked how the funding priorities are incorporated into renewals.
 - Brian noted that they come through in the performance section and the grant spending questions.
- Project Quality Requirements Section
 - Added note that standards and funding priorities will be used in the ranking process
 - Added note that thresholds must be met for renewal projects to be eligible for funding
- General Application Section
 - Removed question about performance standards (this question was removed from the HUD project application last year)
 - Re-worded question to ask if application questions were answered thoroughly and consistently
- Program Design Section
 - Changed question about housing funds to include both PSH and RRH, not just PSH

- Added checkboxes for specific elements of Housing First to determine if projects are following the model
- Added checkboxes for specific elements of PSH Key Elements
- Added 3 more PSH Key Elements (worth 1 point each, since this is the first year grantees will be asked to meet them)
- Changed RRH Program Standards from points to standards (which was a change planned during last year's Scorecard Committee and was noted on the 2016 scorecard)
- Added a question asking if PSH programs have formal move-on programs to help clients move on to other permanent housing when they're ready
- NC BoS CoC Priorities Section
 - Removed admin funds from the housing over services calculation (so programs are not penalized for receiving admin funds)
 - Changed chronically homeless prioritization question from points to standard (since BoS has adopted HUD's chronically homeless prioritization notice and all PSH programs are required to dedicate all beds)
- Project Performance Section
 - Added a note that the HMIS report used to score chronically homeless participation is changing
 - Added explanation of how unit utilization will be calculated
 - Added explanation that staff will follow up with grantees whose APRs include clients who appear ineligible
 - Changed the HMIS report used to assess data completeness
 - Changed wording of question about all projects participating in HMIS
 - Adjusted questions about grantee's APR submission timeliness and following the BoS review process
 - Added a note that grants falling below the spending standard will receive extra review, giving the Project Review Committee leeway in reallocation of funds
 - Added note that staff will interview coordinated assessment leads as well as agencies about taking referrals only through coordinated assessment
 - Monica asked what would happen if the coordinated assessment lead is from the applicant agency. Brian answered that they would find another regional representative involved in coordinated assessment to verify.
 - Clarified the wording of the question about following HUD's prioritization policy
 - Monica asked about the question that awards points for serving Veterans (in the performance section). She noted Vaya's PSH program (and probably others) does not serve many Veterans because Veterans are being served by SSVF or VASH resources. Could this question incentivize non-Veteran programs to serve Veterans eligible for other Veteran-focused resources?
 - Brian and Ehren noted that programs should serve Veterans who are appropriate for their program. For CoC programs, this would usually be Veterans who are ineligible for VA programs.
 - Monica noted that the point totals for the performance section might be inaccurate.
 - Staff noted they would double-check the totals before publication.
- Application Deadlines and Documentation Section
 - Moved the question about match from its own section into this section
 - Removed the question about leverage (since HUD no longer asks for leverage)
 - Added a question asking if the grantee has signed the CoC Grantee Agreement (threshold question)



Review of New Scorecard Proposed Changes

- All content changes have been made on the new scorecard, but the formatting has not been updated. Staff will update the formatting before the scorecard is published.
- All changes made on the renewal scorecard (reviewed above) were also made on the new scorecard, if applicable.
- Goals and Opening Section
 - Added a project type for RRH-TH, which is a new project type that HUD has indicated will be available for new funding in the 2017 competition. At this point, HUD has not released any detailed information about this new project type. The scorecard currently treats this RRH-TH project type as analogous to RRH. Once the NOFA is released, if the RRH-TH type cannot be scored in the same way as RRH, the Scorecard Committee may reconvene to discuss further changes for this project type. Scorecard Committee members agreed to this proposal.
 - Brian also noted that SSO is an allowable project type, but only for coordinated assessment (there is a SSO coordinated assessment section later in the document).
- General Application Section
 - Changed the maximum points for questions about application accuracy from 2 to 3 (so that maximum points match the renewal scorecard)
 - Changed question about prior experience serving homeless people from points to standard
- Program Design Section
 - Added clarification about the types of data applicants can use in their community need statement
 - Removed questions asking about percentages of clients expected to be Veterans, chronically homeless people, and people with disabilities. Replaced these with questions asking for the agency's plan to serve subpopulations, prioritize households with longest histories of homelessness, and ensure people are moved quickly into housing.
 - Added a question asking what priority the project is for its Regional Committee.
 - Kristen asked how the Regional Committees will choose their priorities.
 - Brian and Ehren clarified that priorities will be determined by the Funding Priorities Workgroup, not Regional Committees. The Funding Priorities Workgroup is developing a rubric for priorities for each Regional Committee based on need, project type, and current CoC investment and coverage. The workgroup's recommended rubric will be posted on the NCCEH website in June for review and then presented to the Steering Committee in July for approval.
 - Scorecard Committee members recommended changing the question wording to "What priority is this project in its region?"
 - Added a question asking if new PSH projects are dedicated to serving chronically homeless people (threshold question)
 - Removed questions asking if the project is a permanent housing project requesting housing funds (which was originally a question meant to prioritize PSH over TH, and TH is no longer an option for new projects)
 - Added a question for SSO coordinated assessment projects. It asks if the project will serve the entire CoC (threshold question). The Funding Priorities Workgroup has discussed using CoC funds to create coordinated assessment infrastructure across the entire CoC rather than having agencies apply for local/regional coordinated assessment funding.
 - Kristen noted that we need to add "n/a" as an option to this question for non-SSO projects.



- Changed PSH Key Elements and RRH Program Standards from standards to thresholds and added the 3 new PSH Key Elements that were also added to the renewal scorecard
- Organization Capacity Section
 - Added an option for agencies that have already run a CoC-funded project of a different type
- Performance Section
 - Re-worded the question asking if agency commits to enter 100% of this project's beds into HMIS
- Agency's Relationship to Community Section
 - Removed requirement for Regional Committee to approve new projects. This year, new projects will be asked to get a letter of support from the Regional Committee instead.
 - Monica asked what would happen in the Regional Lead works at the applicant agency. Brian noted that the alternate or another designated member of the Regional Committee could supply the letter instead.
 - Clarified what activities are considered participation in the ESG planning process
 - Clarified that participation in coordinated assessment means only taking referrals from the system
 - Added a question asking if all the agency's projects participate in coordinated assessment
 - A committee member asked what would happen if the coordinated assessment lead works at the applicant agency. Brian noted that staff would need to interview another person who works in the coordinated assessment administration.

Next Steps

- Scorecard Committee members were asked for any other questions or feedback about the proposed scorecards.
 - Monica noted the scorecards look good as they are, pending final information from the NOFA.
- Staff noted that the BoS normally presents the scorecards for approval prior to the NOFA release. If the NOFA includes information that requires more changes, the Scorecard Committee can reconvene.
- Staff proposed that the draft version of the scorecards be posted on the NCCEH website prior to the July 11 Steering Committee meeting so that applicants can review them sooner. The final versions of the scorecards will be posted after the Steering Committee's approval.
 - Scorecard Committee members were asked for their opinion on this proposal; all agreed to it.
- A motion was made to approve the draft renewal scorecard and draft new scorecard (pending formatting changes to be made) [Walker, Frizzell.] All in favor; none opposed.
- Staff will update the formatting on the new scorecard, check for consistency between the new and renewal scorecards, accept changes, and double-check point totals, then send the scorecards out to Scorecard Committee members and post them to NCCEH website.

