BoS Scorecard Committee Meeting
4.11.19

Attendance
Committee Members: Monica Frizzell, Tameka Gunn, Lisa Phillips, Angela Harper King, Linda Mandell, Sabrina Lawson, Tonya Gray, Garth Frieling, Nancy Huff, Jane Earnest, Cameron Cochran, James Mercer

NCCEH Staff: Brian Alexander, Ehren Dohler, Jenn Von Egidy, Andy Phillips

Background
- Prior to the meeting, committee members were provided with copies of the 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.

2018 Scorecards Overview
Staff gave an overview of the renewal and new scorecards and each of the scoring sections within. 2018 scorecards are posted on the NCCEH website:
New
Renewal
Review of Renewal Scorecard Proposed Changes
Staff did an initial review of the scorecards prior to the meeting and added suggested changes to the scorecard via tracked changes in a draft 2019 Renewal Scorecard. Staff reviewed all sections except for Project Performance. Project Performance will be reviewed during the next meeting. Staff and the Scorecard Committee will discuss the draft with tracked changes.

Scorecard Cover Page
Project Type:
- Remove SSO-CE from the Scorecard and treat this application as a critical infrastructure grant that does not need to be scored. This grant is awarded to NCCEH, but then sub-granted to other agencies. Staff suggest that we do not score them as we do project grants, but present the grant progress to the CoC Steering Committee for oversight of an administrative grant.
  - Staff solicited feedback. Monica Frizzell stated she agreed that SSO-CE application should not be scored as it never really fit with the other project applications being scored.

Review of Renewal Scorecard Proposed Changes
Section 1: General Application
- Accuracy and Appropriateness of Responses
  1.1-1.3: Changed questions to score based on consistency with the project application detailed instructions.

1.4: deleted, question is unnecessary with previous changes already made.
- o Angela Harper King stated this change makes sense.

Section II: Program Design
- Housing First
2.2: Revised to use only the project's policies and procedures to score this question. Previously the project application and the policies and procedures were reviewed. Agencies often had conflicting information in their application and their policies and procedures. To encourage the agencies to have accurate policies and procedures, we will only score those.
    - o Monica Frizzell stated she has no problem cutting down the review to one document, but she worries that the policies and procedures cover what the agency does, not what the agencies doesn't do (in this case the question asks that the agency DOESN'T screen out or terminate for certain reasons). She worries the policies and procedures will have holes due to the nature of policy.
    - o Brian stated the lack of information in the policies and procedures actually works in the favor of the agency.
    - o Ehren stated we could add more guidance for the Project Review Committee members on how to look for the housing first tenants in the policies and procedures.
    - o Lisa Phillips stated that this change is fine but adding direction for the Project Review Committee will add consistency.
- Key Elements of Permanent Supportive Housing
2.5: Removed the score "Must meet all statements below" because it doesn't allow for differentiation between those who missed 1 key element and applicants that missed multiple key elements.

    2.5a-i: Removed the review of the Key Elements of PSH form and the house rules. The reviewer will score based on the agencies policies and procedures.

- Rapid Re-Housing Performance Benchmarks and Program Standard
    - o Removed the score "Must meet all statements below" because it doesn't allow for differentiation between those who missed 1 key element and applicants that missed multiple key elements.
    - o Removed the review of other documents and the reviewer will score based on the agencies policies and procedures only.

- Service Plan changed to "Services Resource Leverage Plan"
2.8: Services Funding Plan.
    - o Back ground: To encourage funding to be spent mostly on housing. Grantees have submitted a plan to reduce the amount of funding they have for services and where they can find the funding (ie: other grants, private funding). This plan has not been particularly effective in differentiating projects.
    Added bullets of what the agency should demonstrate to show they are
    - o Suggested to add items that programs should demonstrate
    - o Lisa add a sliding scale for the points instead of all or nothing. Also, add a comments section to mirror the comments section in other sections.
    - o Angela stated we should add a requirement for the applicant to submit the MOUs.

- Permanent Supportive Housing: Move-on Strategy
    - o Changed language from program to strategy.

Next steps
Staff requested the Scorecard Committee review the 2018 Scorecards again prior to the next meeting.