

# Steering Committee Meeting

September 13, 2022

10:30 AM



NCCEH

# Welcome

## Reminders

Your line is muted.

We will unmute the line during Q&A pauses.



The chat box is available to use anytime.



NCCEH

# Roll Call

- We will conduct Roll Call for Regional Leads and at-large members to confirm quorum for voting.
- All participants should enter their full names, so we can document their participation in the minutes.





# NCCEH Staff Announcement



# Agenda

# Agenda

- Consent agenda
- Letter of support request
- ESG project applicant selection
- Coordinated entry evaluation
- Upcoming meetings & reminders





# Letter of Support Request

# Veternation - NCHFA Supportive Housing Financing Application

*Veternation is applying for Supportive Housing Program financing to develop a transitional housing project for male Veterans experiencing homelessness in Lee County.*

- The program will provide 30 transitional beds and up to 12 emergency beds and will serve any male Veteran, regardless of their discharge status.
- Veterans will be provided wrap-around supportive services including employment and educational opportunities, individual and group therapy, as well as community member support.
- A building has already been identified in Sanford, NC and will be renovated to meet the program's needs.





# Veternation Letter of Support Request

Questions?

Motion?





# CY23 ESG Annual Allocation Recommendation

# Reminder: Conflict-of-Interest Policy

- Persons attending the Steering Committee meeting representing an agency applying for CY23 ESG Annual Allocation Funding may **not**:
  - Participate in conversation about the proposed slate
  - Ask questions about the funding proposal for your agency
  - Make a motion related to approving the proposed slate
  - Vote on the proposed slate (please mark 'Abstain' in the chat so we have an official acknowledgement)



# The Project Review Committee has completed the ESG application review process.

CoC staff held an orientation meeting for Project Review Committee members on August 10<sup>th</sup>.

- Orient members to ESG funding
- Explain this year's process and member responsibilities

PRC members and NCCEH staff reviewed project applications and met on August 24<sup>th</sup> to develop the recommended slate of applications.



# Project Applicants submitted materials to NCCEH for review by staff and PRC members.

Project Application deadline was Aug 12th.

By the due date, NCCEH received:

- 33 Renewal Applications
- 13 New Applications

All applications were reviewed using standardized review tools

- Staff reviewed Renewal Applications
  - 3 Renewal Applications were flagged for further review by the PRC.
- Each New Application was reviewed at least 2 times
  - One to two NCCEH staff person(s)
  - One PRC member



# Staff organized the review information, Regional Fair Share, and min/max calculations.

Staff identified the following to organize the information:

- Project Applications with red flags
  - Policies and procedures review raised red flags on a few renewal applications.
  - Some full applications did not provide enough information to score their application.
- Determined whether New Project Applications met CoC and ESG priorities to be considered for funding
- Regional Fair Share and Emergency Response Maximums



# The PRC reviewed each region separately to maximize Fair Share amount.

- Staff and PRC reviewed Fair Share amount for each Regional Committee and determined if they exceeded the 60% cap for Emergency Response activities (SO and ES).

Today, we will go through the full slate proposed by the PRC, by region.



# The CoC introduced a new review tool to evaluate new and renewal applications.

Staff introduced a new tool to guide scoring and funding amounts by calculating mean scores for project type:

- Scorecard results were aggregated by total numbers of “met” vs “unmet” scores. Median scores for each project type when then calculated.
  - Agencies that did not meet the median score for that project type were not eligible to receive an increase in funding
  - Utilizing totaled scores and median scores allowed for a clear precedent in decision making when reducing funding amounts to meet Fair Share.





# The PRC examined agency performance.

- In addition to agencies being scored on program design, equity, funding and capacity, and the agency's relationship to community, the PRC considered an agency's performance using HMIS data.
- Project applicants submitted an APR report, a new requirement this year, which allows for a detailed review of the impact of an agency's services.
- Some agencies struggled with running and submitting an APR report.



# Overall, agency scores were very low.

- Staff held webinars and released project application instructions, with clear requirements for application submissions.
- Still, a new application, new scorecard, and new required documents may have led to some of the observed results.
- The PRC took the approach of a “hold harmless” year for renewal applicants, and no agencies are recommended to be fully defunded.
- However, funding reductions were made, and a few agencies are recommended as “conditionally funded,” needing to participate in TA to address performance or program design concerns.
- All applicants will receive feedback and a message that CY23 funding amounts will not be guaranteed next year.



# When creating the proposed slate, the PRC used precedent from earlier competitions to make decisions.

The PRC used the following precedents to make decisions consistently in each region:

- Allocate funding to agencies who submitted applications after the 8/12/22 deadline only if extra funding was available in the region
  - None received after the deadline this year.
- Allocate any extra available funding to RRH financial assistance
  - No regions were below the Regional Fair Share upon initial review.
- Review funding requests for CY23 versus awarded funding allocations in CY22
- Default to funding renewal applicants and place conditions on those not meeting written standards requirements
  - Agencies that have barriers or problems with policies and procedures may be required to participate in Technical Assistance and update policies or risk losing funding next year.
- [NEW] Renewal agencies with scores below the median for the selected project type are not eligible for increases over the prior year's approved amount.



# The CoC collected Regional Committee input.

- Regional Committees met to consider the applicants applying for ESG funds, provided input on attendance for applicant agencies, and whether the region would like to see applicants funded.
- 8 out of 13 regions completed and submitted the Regional Prioritization Form.
- This information was used to look for additional red flags that may have been missed in reviews.



# The PRC recommends most renewal applicants for continued funding in CY23.

- Majority of regional requests were above Fair Share. Some reductions were made to renewal budgets to meet Fair Share and 60% cap on Emergency Services.
- Agencies not fully adhering to Written Standards or with scores below the median for the project type defaulted to last year's approved funding level and not granted additional funds.
- Agencies with significant barriers in Policies and Procedures or performance issues are recommended for conditional funding upon participation in technical assistance in CY23.
  - Agencies recommended for conditional funding marked with an asterisk.

# The PRC recommends 5 new projects for funding.

PRC members selected 5 new projects because of adherence to best practices and their ability to meet the CoC's Written Standards by 01/01/23:

- Blue Ridge Community Health Services, Inc: SO in Region 01
- Family Crisis Council of Rowan: ES in Region 05
- Allied Churches of Alamance County: ES in Region 06
- Triangle J Council of Governments: SO and HMIS in Region 06
- Carteret County DV Program: ES in Region 13



# Region 01 - \$127,046 Fair Share

## Overview:

- Over Fair Share amount by \$222,033.60
- $\geq$  60% Emergency Response Cap \$139,946.40
- 4 Renewal Applicants
  - HERE in Jackson County: ES, RRH, SO, HMIS
  - REACH of Clay County: ES
  - REACH of Haywood County: ES
  - REACH of Macon County: ES
- 3 New Applicants:
  - Blue Ridge Community Health Services: SO, HMIS
  - Haywood Christian Ministry, Inc: HP
  - Restoration House: ES



# Region 01 - \$127,046 Fair Share

## Proposed decision:

- Cannot fund Haywood Christian Ministries (do not meet eligibility for requirements for HP services)
- Cannot fund Restoration House (application was good but budget included 85% services, which was over the 40% cap – unsure program was viable with required budget shifts)
- Blue Ridge Community Health Services: submitted a good application, SO will cover 4/8 counties in the region. Propose funding at \$20K for SO only. Not fund HMIS to prioritize programmatic funding.
- REACH of Clay Co: requested \$25K. Scores were over median. Proposed at \$20K
- Reach of Haywood – Requested \$20K. Scores were at median. Proposed funding at \$15K
- Reach of Macon Co – Requested \$25K. Scores were below median. Proposed at \$15K
- HERE in Jackson Co – Requested \$79,500 total for ES, SO, RRH, HMIS. Scores were all far below median. Propose not funding SO, since BCCH will cover, fund RRH at \$50,818, fund ES at \$6,228 and not fund HMIS to prioritize programmatic funding.





# Region 01 - \$127,046 Fair Share

Agency	SO	ES	RRH	HP	HMIS	Total
Blue Ridge Community Health	\$20,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$20,000
HERE in Jackson Co	\$0	\$6,228	\$50,818	\$0	\$0	\$57,046
REACH of Macon	\$0	\$15,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$15,000
Reach of Clay	\$0	\$20,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$20,000
REACH of Haywood	\$0	\$15,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$15,000
<b>Total</b>						<b>\$127,046</b>



# Region 02 - \$118,794.00 Fair Share

## Overview:

- Over Fair Share by \$54,485.60
- $\geq$  60% Emergency Response Cap by \$30,897.40
- 3 Renewal Applicants
  - Thrive: RRH
  - HAVEN of Transylvania County: ES
  - Blue Ridge Community Health: SO; HMIS
- Fair Share was reduced to 85.3% of last year's amount.
- All applications were good and above median scores. Cuts had to be made to meet Fair Share.



# Region 02 - \$118,794 Fair Share

## Proposed decision:

- Thrive requested \$47,518. meets 60/40 split. Fund at \$47,518
- The Haven requested \$55K. At median scores. Fund at \$43,276 to meet Fair Share
- Blue Ridge Community Health Center requested \$70,761, a large request over last year's award. Fund at \$28,000. Recommend not funding the HMIS request (\$23,587.20) to prioritize programmatic funding.

# Region 02 - \$118,794.00 Fair Share

Agency	SO	ES	RRH	HP	HMIS	Total
The Haven in Transylvania	\$0	\$43,276	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$43,276
Thrive	\$0	\$0	\$47,518	\$0	\$0	\$47,518
Blue Ridge Health	\$28,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$28,000
<b>Total</b>						<b>\$118,794</b>



# Region 03 - \$192,577 Fair Share

## Overview:

- Over Fair Share amount by \$5,204.00
- $\geq$  60% Emergency Response Cap by \$5,204.00
- 3 Renewal Applicants
  - Dulatown Outreach Center: ES
  - Family Guidance Center: ES
  - McDowell Mission Ministries: SO, ES, RRH



# Region 03 - \$192,577 Fair Share

Proposed decision:

- Dulatown Outreach Center requested \$20K. Scored above median. Fund at \$20K
- McDowell Mission Ministries: ES scored above median. Fund at requested \$28,750. SO scored above median. Conditionally fund at \$40K if they agree to cover the entire region. RRH scores above median. Fund at requested \$77,031.
- Family Guidance Center requested \$32,000. Scores below median. Fund at \$26,796.



# Region 03 - \$192,577 Fair Share

Agency	SO	ES	RRH	HP	HMIS	Total
Dulatown Outreach	\$0	\$20,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$20,000
* McDowell Mission Ministries	\$40,000	\$28,750	\$77,031	\$0	\$0	\$145,781
Family Guidance Center	\$0	\$26,796	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$26,796
<b>Total</b>						<b>\$192,577</b>



# Region 04 - \$170,058 Fair Share

## Overview:

- Over Fair Share by \$77,018.00
- $\geq$  60% Emergency Response Cap by \$77,018
- 3 Renewal Applicants
  - Diakonos: ES, RRH
  - ECHO Ministries: ES
  - Greater Mt. Airy Ministry of Hospitality: ES
- All applicants applied for increased funding from last year.





# Region 04 - \$170,058 Fair Share

Proposed decision:

- Diakanos: ES request is \$52K. Scores were at median. Fund at \$51,866 to meet Fair Share. RRH scores were at median. Fund at requested \$68,023.
- ECHO Ministries requested \$38,000. Scores were above median. Fund at \$27,646 to meet Fair Share.
- Greater Mt. Airy Ministries requested \$89,053. Scores were above median. Fund at \$22,523 to meet Fair Share.

# Region 04 - \$170,058 Fair Share

Agency	S/O	ES	RRH	HP	HMIS	Total
ECHO Ministry	\$0	\$27,646	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$27,646
Diakanos, Inc.	\$0	\$51,866	\$68,023	\$0	\$0	\$119,889
Greater Mt. Airy Ministry	\$0	\$22,523	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$22,523
<b>Total</b>						<b>\$170,058</b>



# Region 5 - \$305,100 Fair Share

## Overview:

- Over Fair Share amount by \$216,900
- $\geq$  60% Emergency Response Cap by \$196,440
- $<$  Housing Stability Minimum by \$6,040
- 2 New Applicants
  - Crisis Ministry of Davidson Co: ES
  - Family Crisis Council of Rowan: ES
- 4 Renewal Applicants
  - Turning Point: ES, HMIS
  - Union County Community Shelter: SO, ES, RRH, HP, HMIS
  - Family Services of Davidson County: ES
  - Homes of Hope: ES, HMIS



# Region 5 - \$305,100 Fair Share

## Proposed decision:

- Crisis Ministry: applied for \$115K. Incomplete application. Proposed not funding
- Family Crisis Council of Rowan: applied for \$40,000. Significant increase from previous years. Propose funding at \$15,000.
- Union Co Community Shelter: ES request \$59,500. Scored above median. Fund at \$55K. Fund SO at requested \$10K. RRH requested \$116K. Scored above median. Fund at \$122,040 to meet minimum. HMIS requested \$5K. Scored above median but prioritized programmatic funding. Fund at \$2,500.
- Family Services of Davidson Co: Scored above median. Fund at requested \$20K
- Turning Point: ES requested \$46,500. Scored below median. Fund at \$25,000. HMIS fund at \$5,000.
- Homes of Hope ES: Requested \$110,000 (significant increase). Scored below median. Fund at \$28,000. HMIS requested \$10,000. Fund at \$2,500.



# Region 5 - \$305,100 Fair Share

Agency	SO	ES	RRH	HP	HMIS	Total
Family Services of Davidson	\$0	\$20,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$20,000
Homes of Hope	\$0	\$28,000	\$0	\$0	\$2,500	\$50,500
Union Co Community Shelter	\$10,000	\$55,000	\$122,040	\$0	\$2,500	\$189,600
Turning Point	\$0	\$25,000	\$0	\$0	\$5,000	\$30,000
Family Crisis Council of Rowan	\$0	\$15,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$15,000
<b>Total</b>						<b>\$305,100</b>

# Region 06 - \$200,101 Fair Share

## Overview:

- Over Fair Share amount by \$92,335.70
- < 60% Emergency Response Cap
- 3 New Applicants
  - Allied Churches of Alamance County: ES
  - Christian Help Center: RRH, HMIS
  - Triangle J Council of Governments, SO, HMIS
- 1 Renewal Applicants
  - Central Piedmont Community Action: RRH



# Region 06 - \$200,101 Fair Share

## Proposed decision:

- Christian Help Center: High barriers, require services, do not take a progressive engagement approach. Not approved for funding.
- Allied Churches of Alamance Co: Requested \$85,195 for ES. Conditionally Fund at \$40,000 with the requirement to participate in TA
- Triangle J COG: Very good application. Fund at requested \$33,000 for SO and \$7,000 for HMIS.
- Central Piedmont: Requested \$113,241. Scored below median. Conditionally fund at \$120,101 (to meet minimum) on the requirement they participate in TA and cover the entire region.



# Region 06 - \$200,101 Fair Share

Agency	SO	ES	RRH	HP	HMIS	Total
Christian Help Center	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
* Allied Churches of Alamance Co	\$0	\$40,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$40,000
Triangle J COG	\$33,000	\$0	\$0	0	\$7,000	\$40,000
* Central Piedmont CA	\$0	\$0	\$120,101	\$0	\$0	\$120,101
<b>Total</b>						<b>\$200,101</b>





# Region 7 - \$367,482 Fair Share

## Overview:

- Over Fair Share amount by \$105,180
- $\geq$  60% Emergency Response Cap by \$5,511.00
- 1 New Applicant
  - Finding Your Strength Shelter and Resource Center: ES
- 5 Renewal Applicants
  - Friend to Friend: ES
  - Johnston-Lee-Harnett Community Action: RRH
  - Sexual Assault Family Emergency of Harnett Co.: ES
  - Outreach Mission: ES
  - HAVEN in Lee Co: ES, HMIS



# Region 7 - \$367,482 Fair Share

## Proposed decision:

- Finding Your Strength: Cannot fund. Incomplete application.
- HAVEN in Lee Co: ES - scored above median. Fund at requested \$25K. HMIS – requested \$21,412. Scored above median. Fund at \$5,000.
- Friend to Friend: ES scored above median. Fund at requested amount of \$45,500.
- JLHCA: RRH – requested \$225,250. Same request as last year. Scored above median. Fund as requested.
- SAFE of Harnett: ES requested \$50,500. Scored below median. Fund at \$41,290
- Outreach Mission: Requested \$80,000. P&P continue to have barriers to shelter; Recommend conditionally funding at \$25,442. Require that all shelter policies match written standards.



# Region 7 - \$367,482 Fair Share

Agency	SO	ES	RRH	HP	HMIS	Total
SAFE of Harnett Co	\$0	\$41,290	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$41,290
Friend to Friend	\$0	\$45,500	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$45,500
* Outreach Mission, Inc	\$0	\$25,442	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$25,442
Johnston, Lee, Harnett CA	\$0	\$0	\$225,250	\$0	\$0	\$225,250
HAVEN in Lee Co	\$0	\$25,000	\$0	\$0	\$5,000	\$30,000
<b>Total</b>						<b>\$367,482</b>



# Region 08 - \$169,856 Fair Share

## Overview:

- Applied for Fair Share exactly
- $\leq$  60% Emergency Response Cap
- 1 Renewal Applicant
  - Southeastern Family Violence Center: ES, RRH

## Proposed decision:

- Fund renewal at requested amounts



# Region 08 - \$169,856 Fair Share

Agency	SO	ES	RRH	HP	HMIS	Total
Southeastern Family Violence Center	\$0	\$37,441	\$132,440	\$0	\$0	\$169,856
Total						\$169,856



# Region 9 - \$231,860 Fair Share

## Overview:

- Over Fair Share by \$168,390.00
- $\geq$  60% Emergency Response Cap by \$103,884.00
- 2 Renewal Applicants
  - Hand Up Ministries: ES
  - The REACH Center: RRH, HP
  - Ripple Effects Group: SO, HMIS



# Region 9 - \$231,860 Fair Share

## Proposed decision:

- The REACH Center: RRH requested \$87,500 (increase). scored at median. Fund at \$112,750 (to reach minimum). HP requested \$50,250. scored above median. Fund at \$25,000.
- Ripple Effects Group: SO requested \$150,000. Scored below median. Conditionally fund at \$46,110 on the requirement to participate in TA. HMIS - requested \$19,500. Scored below median. Fund at \$3,000.
- Hand Up Ministries: Requested \$93,000 (increase). Scored below median. Fund at \$45,000.



# Region 9 - \$231,860 Fair Share

Agency	SO	ES	RRH	HP	HMIS	Total
Hand Up Ministries	\$0	\$45,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$45,000
The REACH Center	\$0	\$0	\$112,750	\$25,000	\$0	\$137,750
* Ripple Effects Group	\$46,110	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,000	\$49,110
<b>Total</b>						<b>\$231,860</b>





# Region 10 - \$236,659 Fair Share

## Overview:

- Applied for Fair Share amount
- $\leq$  60% Emergency Response Cap
- 1 New Applicant:
  - Loving Light Community Outreach: ES
- 2 Renewal Applicants
  - Greene Lamp: RRH, HP
  - Hope Station: RRH, HP, HMIS



# Region 10 - \$236,659 Fair Share

## Proposed decision:

- Loving Light: Application is not eligible for ES. Agency operates a TH program. Not recommended for funding.
- Hope Station: RRH: Fully fund at requested \$57,000. HP fully fund at requested \$31,000. HMIS: requested \$5,000. Scored below median. fund at \$5,000.
- Greene Lamp: RRH: requested \$86,195. Scored well below median. Fund at \$121,532 to meet Fair Share. HP requested \$57,464. Scored well below median. Fund at \$22,127.



# Region 10 - \$236,659 Fair Share

Agency	SO	ES	RRH	HP	HMIS	Total
Hope Station	\$0	\$0	\$57,000	\$31,000	\$5,000	\$93,000
Greene Lamp	\$0	\$0	\$121,532	\$22,127	\$0	\$143,659
<b>Total</b>						<b>\$236,659</b>



# Region 11 - \$109,622 Fair Share

## Overview:

- Over Fair Share by \$111,272.00
- $\leq$  60% Emergency Response Cap
- 1 New Applicant:
  - Daughters of Zion Restoration Inc: HP, HMIS
- 1 Renewal Applicant
  - River City Community Development: ES, RRH



# Region 11 - \$109,622 Fair Share

## Proposed decision:

- Daughters of Zion Inc.: Not recommended for funding due to capacity, budget concerns, and ability to handle a reimbursement-based grant.
- River City CDC: ES – Scored below median. Fund at requested \$42,000 (same as last year). RRH – Requested \$15,000. Scores were at median. Fund at \$52,622. HP – Requested \$52,622. Scores were below median. Fund at \$15,000.



# Region 11 - \$109,622 Fair Share

Agency	S/O	ES	RRH	HP	HMIS	Total
River City CDC	\$0	\$42,000	\$52,622	\$15,000	\$0	\$109,622
Total						\$109,622



# Region 12 - \$152,548 Fair Share

## Overview:

- Over Fair Share by \$1,334
- $\leq$  60% Emergency Response Cap
- 2 Renewal Applicants
  - Center for Family Violence Prevention: ES, HMIS
  - Pitt County Planning: RRH, HMIS



# Region 12 - \$152,548 Fair Share

## Proposed decision:

- Center for Family Violence Prevention: ES - requested \$72,282. Scored at median. Budget issues. Fund at \$54,914, but they must correct the 60/40 split services/operations. HMIS - Fund at requested \$5,000.
- Pitt Co Planning Dept: RRH – requested \$75,000. Scored above median. Fund at \$91,034 to meet 60/40 split. HMIS - fund at requested \$1,600.





# Region 12 - \$152,548 Fair Share

Agency	SO	ES	RRH	HP	HMIS	Total
Center for Family Violence Prevention	\$0	\$54,914	\$0	\$0	\$5,000	\$59,914
Pitt Co Planning Dept.	\$0	\$0	\$91,034	\$0	\$1,600	\$92,634
<b>Total</b>						<b>\$152,548</b>



# Region 13 - \$149,618 Fair Share

## Overview:

- Over Fair Share amount by \$59,924
- > 60% Emergency Response Cap by \$59,924
- 2 New Applicants
  - Religious Community Services: ES
  - Carteret County Domestic Violence Program: ES
- 1 Renewal Applicants
  - Onslow Community Outreach: SO, ES, RRH, HMIS



# Region 13 - \$149,618 Fair Share

## Proposed decision:

- Religious Community Services: ES – requested \$30K. Not recommended for funding due to high barriers and non-adherence to NC BoS CoC written standards.
- Carteret Co DV Program: ES -requesting \$29,924. Presented a good application. Recommend funding at requested amount.
- Onslow Community Outreach: SO – Requested \$3,000. Scored below median. Not recommended for funding. ES - requested \$86,771. Scored well below median. Conditionally fund at \$59,847 with requirement to participate in TA. RRH- requested \$59,847. Scored well below median. Conditionally funded with requirement to participate in TA.



# Region 13 - \$149,618 Fair Share

Agency	S/O	ES	RRH	HP	HMIS	Total
Carteret Co DV Program	\$0	\$29,924	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$29,924
* Onslow Community Outreach	\$0	\$59,847	\$59,847	\$0	\$0	\$119,694
<b>Total</b>						<b>\$149,618</b>



Region	Agency	New/ renewal	SO	ES	RRH	HP	HMIS	Total Approved
Region 1	Blue Ridge Community Health	New	\$20,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$20,000
Region 1	HERE in Jackson Co	Renewal	\$0	\$6,228	\$50,818	\$0	\$0	\$57,046
Region 1	REACH of Macon	Renewal	\$0	\$15,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$15,000
Region 1	Reach of Clay	Renewal	\$0	\$20,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$20,000
Region 1	REACH of Haywood	Renewal	\$0	\$15,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$15,000
Region 2	The Haven in Transylvania	Renewal	\$0	\$43,276	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$43,276
Region 2	Thrive	Renewal	\$0	\$0	\$47,518	\$0	\$0	\$47,518
Region 2	Blue Ridge Health	Renewal	\$28,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$28,000
Region 3	Dulatown Outreach	Renewal	\$0	\$20,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$20,000
Region 3	* McDowell Mission Ministries	Renewal	\$40,000	\$28,750	\$77,031	\$0	\$0	\$145,781
Region 3	Family Guidance Center	Renewal	\$0	\$26,796	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$26,796
Region 4	ECHO Ministry	Renewal	\$0	\$27,646	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$27,646
Region 4	Diakanos, Inc.	Renewal	\$0	\$51,866	\$68,023	\$0	\$0	\$119,889
Region 4	Greater Mt. Airy Ministry	Renewal	\$0	\$22,523	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$22,523

Region	Agency	New/ Renewal	SO	ES	RRH	HP	HMIS	Total Approved
Region 5	Family Services of Davidson	Renewal	\$0	\$20,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$20,000
Region 5	Homes of Hope	Renewal	\$0	\$28,000	\$0	\$0	\$2,500	\$50,500
Region 5	Union Co Community Shelter	Renewal	\$10,000	\$55,000	\$122,040	\$0	\$2,560	\$189,600
Region 5	Turning Point	Renewal	\$0	\$25,000	\$0	\$0	\$5,000	\$30,000
Region 5	Family Crisis Council of Rowan	New	\$0	\$15,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$15,000
Region 6	* Allied Churches of Alamance Co	New	\$0	\$40,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$40,000
Region 6	Triangle J COG	New	\$33,000	\$0	\$0	0	\$7,000	\$40,000
Region 6	* Central Piedmont CA	Renewal	\$0	\$0	\$120,101	\$0	\$0	\$120,101
Region 7	SAFE of Harnett Co	Renewal	\$0	\$41,290	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$41,290
Region 7	Friend to Friend	Renewal	\$0	\$45,500	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$45,500
Region 7	* Outreach Mission, Inc	Renewal	\$0	\$25,442	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$25,442
Region 7	Johnston, Lee, Harnett CA	Renewal	\$0	\$0	\$225,250	\$0	\$0	\$225,250
Region 7	HAVEN in Lee Co	Renewal	\$0	\$25,000	\$0	\$0	\$5,000	\$30,000

Region	Agency	New/ renewal	SO	ES	RRH	HP	HMIS	TOTAL
Region 8	Southeastern Family Violence Center	Renewal	\$0	\$37,441	\$132,440	\$0	\$0	\$169,856
Region 9	Hand Up Ministries	Renewal	\$0	\$45,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$45,000
Region 9	The REACH Center	Renewal	\$0	\$0	\$112,750	\$25,000	\$0	\$137,750
Region 9	* Ripple Effects Group	Renewal	\$46,110	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,000	\$49,110
Region 10	Hope Station	Renewal	\$0	\$0	\$57,000	\$31,000	\$5,000	\$93,000
Region 10	Greene Lamp	Renewal	\$0	\$0	\$121,532	\$22,127	\$0	\$143,659
Region 11	River City CDC	Renewal	\$0	\$42,000	\$52,622	\$15,000	\$0	\$109,622
Region 12	Center for Family Violence Prevention	Renewal	\$0	\$54,914	\$0	\$0	\$5,000	\$59,914
Region 12	Pitt Co Planning Dept.	Renewal	\$0	\$0	\$91,034	\$0	\$1,600	\$92,634
Region 12	Carteret Co DV Program	New	\$0	\$29,924	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$29,924
Region 13	* Onslow Community Outreach	Renewal	\$0	\$59,847	\$59,847	\$0	\$0	\$119,694

**Total amount available to NC BoS CoC: \$ 2,531,321**

# The PRC recommends this ESG Application Slate for approval by the Steering Committee

Questions?

Motion.



NCCEH



# Next steps and timeline

Date/Deadline	Activity
September 13	Steering Committee meeting
September 13	Applicant notifications
September 16	Appeals due
September 19	PRC appeals meeting, if needed
September 20	Steering Committee meeting, ESG appeals (if needed)
October 3	ESG applications due to NC DHHS



# NC BoS CoC 2022 Coordinated Entry Evaluation Report

# NC Bos CoC 2022 CE Evaluation

## Overview

- [HUD Notice CPD-17-01](#) states, “CoCs must solicit feedback at least annually from participating projects and from households that participated in coordinated entry during that time period. Solicitations must address the quality and effectiveness of the entire coordinated entry experience for both participating projects and households...”
- During the 2021 CE Evaluation process, the CoC identified three areas of the evaluation process that needed improvement. In response to these identified sections, the CEC discussed how to engage more providers for a wider range of responses, how to align the provider survey with the client surveys, and how to ensure the surveys are confidential and anonymous.



# NC Bos CoC 2022 CE Evaluation

## 2022 NC BoS CoC CE Evaluation Overview:

- CEC passed motion for evaluation process and timeframe.
- CE Leadership was responsible for distribution and collection of surveys.
- NCCEH staff reviewed all surveys, compiled data, and reported outcomes to CEC.
- CEC will discuss system improvements and help facilitate changes.



# NC BoS CoC 2022 CE Evaluation

The evaluation consisted of three elements:

- Surveys to participating provider agencies
- Surveys to people who are enrolled in permanent housing programs
  - Rapid Re-housing and Permanent Supportive Housing
- Surveys to people currently experiencing homelessness
  - Emergency Shelter and/or Unsheltered



# NC BoS CoC 2022 CE Evaluation

Surveys to participating provider agencies:

- Provider agencies completed 31 surveys.
- Survey respondents included agencies that participated in every part of the CE system.
- Provider surveys were completed in 11 of the 13 regions of NC BoS CoC, with no information submitted for Region 8 and 13.



# NC BoS CoC 2022 CE Evaluation

Provider surveys included questions in relation to:

- Prevention and Diversion
  - 39% of the respondents said the P&D screen generally does divert households from homelessness, and approximately 61% said it does not.
- VI-SPDAT
  - 17% of respondents said the VI-SPDAT accurately reflects the needs of the people the organization serves while 73% said it is accurate only half the time.
- Case conferencing
  - 100% of agencies said they attend case conferencing meetings. All CoC regions have an option to virtually join case conferencing, which has allowed more participation than previously.
- Referrals to permanent housing
  - 72% of permanent housing programs said they always and/or usually receive eligible referrals, with only 12% stating they sometimes, rarely, or never receive eligible referrals from the CE system.



# NC BoS CoC 2022 CE Evaluation

Surveys to people who are enrolled in permanent housing programs:

- People living in permanent housing have been through every aspect of the coordinated entry system. The NC BoS CoC asked participants to evaluate their experience moving through the CE system.
  - 39 people completed surveys, which is a 50% increase from 2021.
- The survey asked respondents to evaluate the services they received while they were experiencing homelessness.
  - The overwhelming majority of people said being connected to permanent housing was the most helpful service they received. Emergency shelter, connection to DV shelter, and food were also important.





# NC BoS CoC 2022 CE Evaluation

- Our current CE system does not prioritize households for emergency shelter. However, connecting people experiencing homelessness to emergency services is one of the key functions of coordinated entry.
  - 40% of respondents had no problems while staying in shelter
  - 12% said they could not enter shelter at which they presented
  - 3% said they were forced to leave a shelter
  - 40% did not stay in shelter
- Only one person reported problems while in shelter and stated they had problems with other shelter residents. No one reported feeling discriminated against by shelter staff and/or shelter staff not being respectful.



# NC BoS CoC 2022 CE Evaluation

Surveys to people currently experiencing homelessness.

- BoS collected surveys from people in emergency shelters and people living unsheltered. These surveys were confidential and completely optional.
- The access point offered the chance to complete a survey after the provider assessed the client using the VI-SPDAT.
- Most surveys collected were from people in emergency shelters, with 62 shelter surveys completed. 17 respondents completed the unsheltered survey.
- When asked what type of assistance would be most helpful, 79% of people stated help getting into an emergency shelter, permanent housing, and/or food as their top priorities.



# NC BoS CoC 2022 CE Evaluation

## Timeliness

- BoS asked questions in every survey about how quickly the CE system connects people to permanent housing and services.
  - For many people, the CE system quickly connects them to permanent housing, but approximately 29% of households were not connected to permanent housing after 6 months.
  - A majority of people experiencing homelessness (71%) expect to find housing quickly, with 42% stating they expect to find housing in less than three months.
  - People currently experiencing homelessness seem to have overly optimistic views of how long it will take to find permanent housing. Among people currently in permanent housing, most people (64%) waited at least 3 months for housing, and 34% waited 6 months or more.
  - The CoC should train provider staff to communicate the process and timeframe of finding housing, so people currently experiencing homelessness have a more accurate expectation.



# NC BoS CoC 2022 CE Evaluation

The CoC could make improvements to its CE system:

- Emergency shelters should continue to lower barriers and become more housing focused.
- The VI-SPDAT does not score clients accurately and has been shown to have racial bias. The CoC will form a workgroup to develop a new CE assessment and prioritization schedule that more accurately reflects the needs of households and supports diversity, equity, and inclusion.
- Front Door Providers need more support from Permanent Housing (PH) programs to provide a warm transfer when a household has been identified and referred for a PH slot and/or voucher.



# NC BoS CoC 2022 CE Evaluation

The CoC could make improvements to its CE system:

- With the ending of ESG-CV Homelessness Prevention funds, communities are struggling with how to support households experiencing Category 2 Imminent Risk of Homelessness.
- People experiencing homelessness in the CoC are not offered permanent housing options quickly. The CoC needs to reduce the length of time people experience homelessness and have discussions on how to increase affordable housing.

Motion to approve 2022 CE Evaluation Report?

# Upcoming meetings & reminders

*(Log-in information can be found on agenda)*

- **HMIS System Updates**, *Tuesday, September 13, 10:30 – 11:30 A.M.*
- **Coordinated Entry Council Meeting**, *Monday, September 19, 2022, 10:00 – 11:30 A.M.*
- **Racial Equity Subcommittee Meeting**, *Wednesday, September 21, 2022, 11:30 A.M. – 12:30 P.M.*
- **Local Leadership Response Sharing Call**, *Wednesday, September 21, 2022, 1:00 – 2:00 P.M.*
- **Funding and Performance Subcommittee Meeting**, *Thursday, September 22, 2022, 11:00 A.M. – 12:00 P.M.*
- **HMIS Training: When Clients Decline Consent**, *Tuesday, September 27, 2022, 10:00 – 11:00 A.M.*

# Next Meeting(s)

- Tuesday, September 20, 2022, at 10:00 A.M. – **Special CoC NOFO Ranking Approval**
- Tuesday, September 27, 2022, at 10:30 A.M. – ***[Tentative]* Special CoC NOFO Appeals Meeting**

Reach out to us:

(919) 755-4393

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



**NCCEH**