Scorecard Committee Meeting #2
March 21, 2023

Attendees: Lori Watts (R01), Trisha Ecklund (R02), Sindy Connell (R03), Teena Willis (R04), Erin Gaskin (R05), Andrea Wiley (R06), Crystal Gwendo (R10), Kisha Darden (R11)

Staff Present: Jenny Simmons, Brian Alexander

Minutes:

The Scorecard Committee reviewed draft revisions to the FY2023 New Project Scorecard. NC BoS CoC staff, Data Center staff, the Racial Equity Subcommittee, and the Lived Expertise Advisory Council all provided feedback for the draft. Also feedback from last year's Project Review Committee was incorporated.

All updates to dates and date ranges were accepted. All general language and form clarification updates were accepted.

Introductory page, general edits made. Added "NC BoS CoC" before written standards and added "maintain high data quality" as descriptors. Discussion around setting the expectation that projects will maintain high data quality and no benchmarks set yet around data quality. Group to be mindful that after point totals are recalculated, at least 33% of all points need to be for Objective Standards (yes or no questions) and 20% of all points are for System Performance Measures. These percentages are important for the CoC-wide application as extra points are earned.

Combined Scoring Section:

Section I: General Application

a. Consistency with Mission – general language edits and clarity of form name made in 1.1a and 1.1b. No content changes.

b. Accuracy and Appropriateness of Responses – question reference in the project application was updated in 1.2a, general language changes were made to better clarify the question, and the question reference was updated in 1.2b. In 1.2c, the question was updated to the question that exists in the application.

Section II: Program Design

a. Community Need Statement – general edits and clarity of form name in 2.1, 2.1c – clarified importance of using the existing CE system, and 2.1f; deletion of 2.2 "Targeting to Prioritized Subpopulations" subheading; language updates in 2.2a, general edits and form clarity in 2.2c.

b. PSH, RRH, TH-RRH Only: Service Resource Leverage Plan – language clarification and defined what it means to be "above" the 25% required match. Benchmark set and approved by the committee at 15% or more above the 25% match requirement. Also clarified what documentation needs to be turned in for this question (an MOU/MOA/or contract). A discussion was held around the purpose of this question which is to incentivize building collaborations or resources to support households beyond what they are bringing in for the match requirements. It also helps incentivize building relationships to assist the program.

A discussion was held around clarifying requirements for new RRH projects: non-profit agencies must have their 501c3 for at least 3 years. Agencies must be operating a rapid rehousing project using ESG or another funding source before applying to use CoC Program funds. The RRH program already in operation does not have to be one in operation within the NC BoS CoC. Exceptions are made for PHAs since they cannot apply for ESG funds. Since CoC Program funding is a larger amount of funding and renewals have been given priority over new projects, and PSH projects are prioritized for CoC Program funding, the CoC has focused on using CoC Program funds to scale up RRH.

c. Housing First: Question number adjustment and language clarifications were made in this section.

d. PSH Projects Only: Key Elements of Permanent Supportive Housing – no changes.

e. For TH-RRH and RRH Programs Only: Rapid Rehousing Performance Benchmarks and Program Standards:
    a. Core Program Standards: Housing Identification: no changes.
    b. Core Program Standard: Rent and Move-in Assistance – general edit in 2.6b1
    c. Core Program Standard: Rapid Rehousing Case Management and Services: no changes
    d. Core Program Standard: Program Philosophy and Design – general edits. In 2.6d1

Section III: Scope of Services

a. 3.2 Employment Services (PSH, RRH, TH-RRH only) – changed what document we need to review this question – in Program Policies & Procedures instead of Project Application: 4A Question 3.

b. 3.3 Access to Mainstream Benefits (PSH, RRH, TH-RRH only) – general edit to add a better descriptor and project application question number update.

Section IV: Equity

a. 4.2 – form name clarification

b. 4.3 – Racial Equity Subcommittee recommended a question change and to set the new question as a standard. This change meets HUD's expectations regarding the use of professional interpreters. The documentation requirement recommended a change from an MOA/MOU to the New Project Thresholds and Standards Form where applicants can explain their interpretation services. The Scorecard Committee accepted this change.

   Does your organization have an arrangement for professional/trained interpretation services? In-person or remote interpretation from trained providers are both applicable. Staff can be considered interpreters if they have been trained or certified as interpreters. Bi-lingual staff or volunteers without documented training (internal or external) or certification do not qualify as trained interpreters. [New Project Thresholds and Standards Form]

c. 4.5 – form name clarification

d. 4.6 – Racial Equity Subcommittee recommended a question to change the focus to professional racial equity training. The Scorecard Committee discussed having agencies include in their narrative (in the New Project Thresholds and Standards Form), how they have achieved professional racial equity training and their intentions regarding Racial Equity training for the entire organization. It was also discussed that if agencies have Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion departments with professionally trained staff who provide internal agency trainings, these will be accepted in 4.6.

   Has your staff engaged in professional racial equity training in the past 12 months for the purpose of impacting equity within your agency? Examples include the Racial Equity Institute (REI) Phase 1 or Groundwater trainings, Organizing Against Racism (OAR) training, or Race Forward training. [New Project Thresholds and Standards Form]

e. 4.8, 4.9, 4.10 – form name clarification

f. 4.11 – The Lived Expertise Advisory Council recommended this question addition. It was accepted by the Scorecard Committee and set as a Standard.

   Has the agency incorporated the NC BoS CoC Client Bill of Rights into internal policies and procedures? [New Project Thresholds and Standards Form]

g. 4.12 – The Lived Expertise Advisory Council recommended this question addition and that it be set as a Standard. There was discussion regarding there being no official parameters for what is considered lived expertise. HUD did have a differentiation in the CoC-wide application last year regarding those involved in CoC governance, between people with lived experience within the last 7 years vs those beyond 7 years. A discussion also about considering feedback that does not result in a policy change. The question was accepted and set as a Standard.

Has the agency changed an internal policy within the last 12 months as a result of feedback from current/former clients? [New Project Thresholds and Standards Form]

h. 4.13 – The Racial Equity Subcommittee recommended this new question to address racial equity (not professional training) by an entire agency. The recommendation included a benchmark of 20% for an agency's total staff. There was discussion about the importance of and the challenge of this benchmark being set for an agency's total staff. The Scorecard Committee accepted the question and changed the benchmark to 80% of the total project staff. Agencies will list on the New Project Thresholds and Standards Form their number of project staff and the number of staff who attended.

Has your staff attended community events, conferences, or panel conversations in the past 12 months on the topic of racial equity, anti-racism, or indigenous rights? Please include the number of staff that attended. Benchmark at 80% of total program staff. [New Project Thresholds and Standards Form]

i. 4.14 – The Lived Expertise Advisory Council recommended this question addition. There was a discussion about whether this question should address the entire agency vs project staff and the area of lived expertise being in homelessness. The Scorecard Committee accepted this question and adjusted the document submission from "Sample hiring announcements" to "Sample hiring announcements showing range of different levels within the agency."

Do agency hiring announcements cite lived experience of homelessness as a relevant skill for open positions at all levels in the agency? [*Sample hiring announcements showing range of different levels within the agency*]

j. 4.15 – The Lived Expertise Advisory Council recommended this question addition. Benchmark set at 10%. The Scorecard Committee accepted this question. Agencies will indicate the number of program staff and the number of staff with lived expertise on the New Project Thresholds and Standards Form.

What percentage of agency staff involved in operating or administering the CoC-eligible activities have experienced homelessness? Benchmark at 10%. [New Project Thresholds and Standards Form]

Staff Scoring Section:

Section V: Organizational Capacity

a. Completed Similar Projects – 5.1, 5.2 general edits and form name clarification
b. Agency Stability – 5.3 form name clarification; 5.4 general edit
c. Capacity to Provide Needed Services – 5.7 – form name clarification
d. 5.8 SOAR case manager training – provided online. No changes.
e. The Data Center recommended this question be added to address issues with funded agencies not being responsive during the year to SPM, LSA, PIT/HIC data collection, data collection, and data entry. The Scorecard Committee accepted the addition and added "HMIS Participating Agencies Only" at the beginning. Now 5.9 will be:

HMIS Participating Agencies Only: Will staff delivering services be responsible for recording client data in HMIS? (dedicated HMIS data entry staff is historically less successful at data management) [New Project Thresholds and Standards Form]

f. The Data Center recommended this question be added regarding the HMIS Agency Administrator role. The Scorecard Committee accepted the addition and added (HMIS Participating Agencies Only) at the beginning. Now 5.10 will be:

HMIS Participating Agencies Only: Does the agency have a staff person identified for the HMIS Agency Administrative Role to manage the project's HMIS data? (Note, if the role is the Executive Director's or President's, no points applied. Eds historically do not have capacity to fill this role.) [New Project Thresholds and Standards Form]

g. Administrative Capacity – re-numbering 5.11 and 5.12 due to questions added above. General edit and form clarification in 5.12.

Section VI: Project Performance

a. Instruction paragraph general edits and inclusion of Comparable Database.

b. 6.1a – RRH Projects: What percentage of the people served by the project had a disability? The Funding & Performance Subcommittee set a new benchmark of 35% or above, down from 50% or above based on a review of HMIS baseline data. The Scorecard Committee accepted the change.

c. 6.1b – HMIS custom report clarification

d. 6.1f – PSH Projects: What percentage of exits were to a permanent housing destination? Deleted "No exits' category with 5 points because we do not want to incentivize PSH Projects not exiting program participants to permanent housing.

e. 6.1h – PSH Projects: What percentage of adults gained or increased total unearned cash income? The Funding & Performance Subcommittee set a new benchmark of 30% and above (up from 20% and above); adjusted ranges to projects with below 10% to receive 0 points; 10 – 29% to receive 10 points; 30% and above to receive 15 points.

f. 6.1j – Added question, pulled over from the Renewal Scorecard. From the Funding & Performance Subcommittee with a Benchmark of 20% or below. This is a System Performance Measure. The Scorecard Committee accepted this question.

What percentage of people who exited to PH returned to homelessness within 2 years? [0701 SPM Report] – point options 0-20% receive 10 points; greater than 20% receive 0 points.

g. HMIS/Comparable Database Participation
    a. 6.2a – general edits

b. 6.2b Added Question. The Scorecard accepted this additional question.

Was the Agency responsive to the Data Center in annual corrections (for LSA or SPM reports)? [*Was the CoC Lead copied on communication to escalate responsiveness*] Yes = 0 points; No = 5 points

c. 6.2c Added Question. The Scorecard Committee accepted this additional question.

Were any HMIS users inactivated due to lack of login compliance (every 60 days) during CY2022? [*Data Center records*]

h. HUD Monitoring – 6.3a – form name clarification; 6.3b – general edits

Section VII: Agency's Relationship to Community

a. Participation in Regional Committee Activities – general edits and form clarification, number adjustments in this section. 7.6 added a Benchmark of 85% participation in case conferencing. [CE Lead verified minimum of 85% participation in case conferencing.]

b. Current PSH, RRH Grantees: CE Assessment – updated language of subheading, number adjustments in this section, general edits and form name clarification

Section VIII: Application Deadlines and Documentation – numbered adjustments in this section

Next Steps

Meeting #3 – Tuesday, March 28 from 10:30 AM – 12:30 PM – We will meet to review the draft FY23 Renewal Project Scorecard. We will not need to review the sections/questions that are the same in both scorecards as we have revised those in our meeting today. In our meeting next week, we will finalize suggested changes and vote to recommend scorecards to the NC BoS CoC Steering Committee.

April 4, 2023, Steering Committee Meeting – scorecards will be presented to the NC BoS CoC Steering Committee for final approval.

Our next meeting is Tuesday, March 28th at 10:30 AM.