



# North Carolina Balance of State Continuum of Care

---

[bos@ncceh.org](mailto:bos@ncceh.org)

919.755.4393

[www.ncceh.org/BoS](http://www.ncceh.org/BoS)

## Scorecard Committee Meeting

June 17, 2016

Committee Members: Ellery Blackstock, Nicole Dewitt, Monica Frizzell, Bob Lawler, Jefferey Rawlings, Tammy Rogers, Candice Rountree, Taniza Tabb, Jamal Troublefield, Janice Johnson

Public: Brian Fike

Staff: Nancy Holochwost, Emily Carmody, Brian Alexander

### FY 2016 CoC Competition Overview

Staff provided an update on the FY2016 CoC Grant Competition and Funding.

- No firm details, in general
- CoCs will continue to rank and tier projects based on:
  - Performance
  - HUD and CoC priorities
- Potential for new/bonus projects - RRH and PSH
  - Will revise both new and renewal scorecards this year

Staff provided an update on the competition timeline and anticipated release of the CoC NOFA.

- CoC Registration (being finalized)
- Grant Inventory Worksheet (GIW) (being finalized)
- Next: Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA)
  - Anticipate to come out at the end of June
  - Will provide details of available funding
    - New/bonus projects
    - Eligible activities
    - HUD's priorities and scoring for CoCs

### BoS CoC Scorecard Overview

Staff provided the Committee with an overview of the goals of the BoS CoC scorecards, scorecard sections, and how the Project Review Committee uses it to determine tiering and ranking of projects.

The four goals of the new and renewal scorecards are:

- Fund organizations that have the capacity to run effective programs (can manage and administer the program, can operate on reimbursement basis, have experience serving this population or a similar one)

- Fund projects that reflect the Balance of State Continuum of Care & HUD's priorities: permanent supportive housing and serving the chronically homeless and veterans
- Incentivize agencies to be good partners (participating in community efforts to end homelessness, on HMIS, helping create infrastructure for their community's homeless service system to operate effectively throughout the year)
- Ensure that funded projects are being good stewards of BoS CoC funding and performing to BoS CoC standards

The new and renewal scorecards are divided into two sections:

- Part1: Combined Scoring
  - Scored by NCCEH staff + 1 member of Project Review Committee
    - Project Review Committee member from a distant Regional Committee
  - Scores averaged
- Part 2: Staff Scoring
  - Scored by NCCEH staff only
  - Focused on HUD technical questions and performance

The Project Review Committee uses the scorecard during the competition.

- Project Review Committee works with BoS staff to score all applications
- PRC creates a ranking recommendation to the Steering Committee based on:
  - Scores
  - Meeting standards/minimums
  - Late applications
  - Eligibility per HUD funding rules

### **Review of the New and Renewal Scorecards in the 2015 Competition**

Staff provided a review of how the New and Renewal scorecards were used in the 2015 CoC Competition.

The BoS CoC ranked 46 projects for the FY2015 competition.

- 44 renewal projects
  - 43 scored
  - 1 HMIS grant not scored (CoC-wide grant, not housing)
- 2 out of 5 new project applications ranked
  - 3 ineligible
    - 1 RRH – did not meet ESG standard
    - 2 PSH – late, not serving 100% chronically homeless
  - 1 PSH for Henderson County
  - 1 RRH for Alamance County

Ranking of projects had an impact on who was funded in the FY2015 competition.

- BoS CoC awarded \$1,249,382
  - Requested \$1,435,828
  - Two renewal projects not funded for a total of \$257,834
- Renewals who did not receive funding were ranked last

Staff reviewed a breakdown of the 2015 project scores.



Type	Possible Points	Highest Score	Lowest Score	Average Score
All		149	45.5	97.8
PSH	199	149	45.5	99.4
RRH	184	106	84.5	97.9
TH	179	77.5	55	66.3

Staff explained how minimums are set for each section on both new and renewals scorecards and how those minimums impacted project scoring in the FY2015 competition.

- 2015 Scorecard:
  - “Renewal/New projects must receive at least the minimum score in each section. If the minimum is not met, further review will be triggered. After further review, the Project Review Committee will determine potential consequences, including whether the project is ineligible for inclusion in final BoS CoC application.”
- Minimums have been used in the ranking process
  - Performance minimums for not having APR to score
- 2 out of 7 Sections had minimum issues
  - CoC Priorities
    - Minimum:11
    - 5 agencies/6 projects did not meet
  - Project Performance
    - Minimum:
      - PSH: 48
      - RRH/TH: 30
    - 3 agencies/17 projects did not meet
    - 1 agency/13 projects did not turn in APR to score

Staff explained how standard questions are used on both new and renewals scorecards and how those minimums impacted project scoring in the FY2015 competition.

- Standard options are either (met/not met/NA)
- Don’t want to reward points for something the projects should be doing
- Project Review Committee has used standards as part of the ranking process in the past
  - PSH Key Elements
  - Late applications

Renewal Scorecard Standard Questions:

- PSH Key Elements
- Services Funding Plan
- PSH prioritizing CH beds
- Match/leverage documentation
- HUD monitoring findings
- Submitting application and paperwork by CoC deadline

New Scorecard Standard Questions:

- Project fits with agency mission
- Leasing statement



- RRH applicants receive ESG funding
- Services Funding Plan
- PSH Key Elements
- Agency Stability: operating 3 years, Nonprofits: audit, budget capacity, board and minutes
- Capacity for services
- Match/leverage documentation
- Participation in Regional Committee: meetings, present application, ESG, coordinated assessment
- Submitting application and paperwork by CoC deadline

In the FY2015 competition some projects did not meet standards:

Standard	# Projects	# Agencies
PSH Key Elements	30	14
Services Funding Plan	8	7
Prioritizing beds for chronically homeless	15	8
Leverage	17	9

### Possible Changes for the 2016 New and Renewal Scorecards

Staff reviewed possible changes for the FY2016 scorecards, including:

- Adding new questions to incorporate new resources and information
- Taking away questions that are no longer asked on application or not a priority
- Changing questions from points to standards
- Changing minimums if necessary
- Updating language

Staff outlined next steps to send the Scorecard Committee the FY 2015 scorecards and draft FY2016 scorecards for review. Suggested changes will be discussed at the next meeting.

Next Meeting: Tuesday, June 21<sup>st</sup> from 10-11:30 AM

