



North Carolina Balance of State Continuum of Care

bos@ncceh.org

919.755.4393

www.ncceh.org/BoS

BoS Scorecard Committee Meeting 6.15.18

Attendance

Committee Members: Melissa Eastwood, Bob Williams, Micky Robinson, Richard Gary, Tameka Gunn, Bonnie Harper, Tareka McCollum, Monica Frizzell, Lisa Phillips,

NCCEH Staff: Brian Alexander, Ehren Dohler

Background

- Prior to the meeting, committee members were provided with copies of the draft 2018 new and renewal scorecards.
- Staff has created a draft with proposed changes that are documented in tracked changes. The draft with the tracked changes was projected for the committee members to see during the meeting.
- NC BoS CoC staff and committee members reviewed the proposed changes in detail.

Review of the Renewal Scorecard Proposed Changes

- Ehren gave an overview of the typical renewal scorecard and explained differences between new and renewal scorecards.
 - More points exist in the renewal scorecard due to the increased number of performance questions.
- Changed the date on the scorecard from 2017 to 2018
- Added SSO-CE as a project type for renewal because this now exists in the NC BoS CoC.
- Number of overall points have changed with some questions being changed to standards and other questions adding or subtracting points.

Section II

2.1: Legacy question that no longer applies because the NC BoS CoC no longer has any transitional housing projects. A portion of this question about housing versus services exists in question 3.1c. Staff recommend deleting this question. Members confirmed agreement to delete.

Key Elements of PSH and RRH Benchmarks and Program Standards will include the same changes as discussed in the prior Scorecard Committee meeting for the new scorecard. Ehren reviewed the changes and introduced the draft language written by staff.

- The last three Key Elements of PSH have been changed from points to standards. These three Key Elements were new last year. Traditionally when adding an item that will become a future, the item will be points in the first year and then change to standard in subsequent years. Staff have changes these three Key Elements from points to standards in the 2018 renewal scorecard.

- Tameka asked about the explanation under standard 2.7b2 and what “strict time” mean. Ehren explained that this means that projects should be flexible in approach to the amount of time supporting participants in the program. Projects should not have a strict or standardized amount of time they will help all households enrolled in the project.
 - Ehren explained the explanation under standard 2.7c2. Tameka asked for clarification. Ehren and Brian explained that projects should have flexibility in their approach to the term case management. Just because a household doesn’t meet with a case manager once, does not mean the project should terminate a household.
- 2.9: Changed the move-on strategy question to 10 points from 5 points. The updated question includes information about what projects would need to do to get these points.

Section IV

4.21: Changed language to provide more information on coordinated assessment to ensure that project review committee members understand what they are scoring.

Review of New Scorecard Proposed Changes

- Staff recalculated the number of points with proposed changes.
- Ehren reviewed each change proposed at the last meeting with draft language included.

Project Performance Section

- Ehren talked through the issues from the last Scorecard Committee meeting to this section. The intention of committee members was to give credit to all funded projects if they have good performance.
 - Staff talked with the Data Center about how best to measure performance of different activities with different types. Staff determined that an APR can be run for any type of project. The only change that would need to be made to the new scorecard is to revise the instructions for all project applicants to run an HMIS APR for the project and give directions about how to do this.
 - Staff asked for feedback and questions from committee members. Members suggested that this was a good fix and adequately addressed their concerns.
- Staff cleaned up the section on HMIS to include information on the comparable database to be more inclusive of domestic violence providers.

5.14: Ehren reminded members about the discussion on this question. Since grant extensions only apply to existing CoC grantees, the question was changed from points to a standard since not all agencies (or even most agencies) applying would be eligible for the points.

Agency Relationship to Community section

6.3: Ehren reminded members about the discussion on this question. The question is meant to incentivize applicants who are more involved in the local ESG process. Staff changed the wording to be more specific about involvement saying that the applicant participated in a scoring or other ESG subcommittees. This question was changed from a standard to points, incentivizing applicants who actively participate in their local ESG process.

6.4-6.6: Staff updated the coordinated assessment questions.

- 6.4: Staff added “actively” participate and then added language to clarify what that means



- 6.5: Staff added a question scoring applicants' answers on what coordinated assessment means. Staff will put the question on the New Project Form filled out during the competition.
- 6.6: Staff updated the wording on this question, adding some description to the question about what will be scored.
- Staff asked for questions or feedback. No questions or feedback received from members.

Next Steps

- Ehren asked members if they had any questions or feedback about the changes discussed on either the new or renewal scorecard
 - Bob stated that the scorecards looks good and are better than in years past.
 - Tareka agreed that both of the scorecards look good.
 - Richard agreed that the scorecards are better than in years past.

Motion to approve the 2018 new and renewal draft scorecards (Williams, Phillips). All in favor. None opposed.

