



North Carolina Balance of State Continuum of Care

bos@ncceh.org

919.755.4393

www.ncceh.org/BoS

Scorecard Committee Meeting #3 March 28, 2023

Attendees: Lori Watts (R01), Trisha Ecklund (R02), Sindy Connell (R03), Teena Willis (R04), Erin Gaskin (R05), Kay Johnson (R07), Crystal Gwendo (R10), Kisha Darden (R11)

Staff Present: Jenny Simmons, Brian Alexander

Minutes:

The Scorecard Committee reviewed draft revisions to the FY2023 CoC Program Renewal Project Application Scorecard. 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 here that were made in the New Project Scorecard. Added "NC BoS CoC" before written standards and added "maintain high data quality" as descriptors. Group to be mindful that after point totals are recalculated, at least 33% of all points need to be for objective measures (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. 1.2 - question updated to match current Project Application; changed to: Has the applicant answered all questions regarding services? [*Project Application 4A*]. Reduced points from 3 to 2. Also clarified the documentation materials for this question.
- b. 1.3 - question updated to match current Project Application; changed to: Did the applicant complete all sections of the overall application adequately (answer all relevant questions; provide detailed answers per the Project Applicant Detailed Instructions; fill out all charts) [*Project Application; Project Application Detailed Instructions*]. Increased total points from 3 to 4. Also clarified the documentation materials for this question.

Section II: Equity – moved from Section III to Section II to remain part of the Combined Scoring Section and updated section and question numbers. All changes to this section were made as discussed during Meeting #2. See Meeting #2 minutes.

Section III: Program Design - moved from Section II to Section III, split between Combined Scoring (Leverage section) and Staff Scoring (Housing First, Key Elements of PSH, and RRH Performance Benchmarks and Program Standards) as CoC staff have implemented feedback to consider scoring some items before the competition to make the intense, time-limited competition scoring process easier. There will be a Pre-Competition Scoring and Standards Review that will certify renewal projects for a 3-year term (FY2023 – FY2025). Agencies that achieve all standards will be certified and will not have to turn in policies and procedures again until the FY2026 competition if there are no changes. Those agencies who miss a standard will have the opportunity to revise and resubmit their policies and procedures for certification for FY2024 – FY2026.

Updated section and question numbers

- a. 2.4 became 3.1: PSH and RRH: Service Resource Leverage Plan – Updated language in this section to clarify questions/challenges expressed in last year's competition and clarification of provided benchmark for the amount of leverage needed to meet the intent of this question. The same change was made to this question in the New Scorecard. There was a question about whether or not this applies to PSH Project Renewals who are only requesting Rental Assistance and Administration funding. This applies to all renewal projects regardless of budget line items. A further question was asked if Medicaid and State service funding that program participants utilize while in the program could be used for the leverage (15% above match). The answer was yes. Applicants can show this through documentation of an MOU, MOA, contract, official letter.
- b. Housing First section– same changes made here as in New Project Scorecard Housing First section. Question numbers changed from 2.1 to 3.2a-c.
- c. Key Elements of Permanent Supportive Housing – 2.2a – 2.2i became 3.3a – 3.3i.
- d. Rapid Rehousing Performance Benchmarks and Program Standards – 2.3a – 2.3d4 became 3.4a – 3.4d4.
- e. Permanent Supportive Housing: Moving-on Strategy – numbering adjustment 2.5 became 3.5.
- f. Targeting to Prioritized Subpopulations section header was deleted information was moved to the question column and the question number was changed from 2.6 to 3.6.

Section IV: Project Performance – dates for CoC Annual Performance Report were updated.

- a. 4.1a – RRH Projects: What percentage of the people served by the project had a disability? Funding & Performance Subcommittee set a new benchmark of 35% or above. Same changes were made here as in the New Project Scorecard.
- b. 4.1b – PSH Projects: updated date.
- c. 4.1d – Deleted question – The Funding & Performance Subcommittee deleted this benchmark as it is not something collected by RRH providers.
- d. 4.1e – general format revision and number adjustment to 4.1d.

- e. 4.1g, now 4.1f – general format revision. Deleted No Exits scoring option as was done in the New Project Scorecard.
- f. 4.1i, now 4.1h – PSH Projects: What percentage of adults gained or increased total unearned cash income? Funding & Performance Subcommittee set a new benchmark of 30% and above (up from 20% and above); adjusted ranges to below 10% receives 0 points; 10 – 29% receives 10 points; 30% and above receives 15 points.
- g. 4.1j, now 4.1i – PSH Only edited to PSH Projects and date range of report adjusted.
- h. 4.1k, now 4.1j – RRH Only edited to RRH Projects, date range of report adjusted, points increased in 10-20% category from 10 to 15 and increased in 0-10% category from 3 to 5.
- i. 4.1k – Added Question – Benchmark set by Funding & Performance Subcommittee

RRH Projects: Median length of project participation for leavers. [*CoC-APR Q22B*]; 180 – 270 receive 10 points; below 180 or over 270 receive 0 points.
- j. HMIS Participation – section header, language updated.
- k. 4.2b – general edits and date updated. For “yes” response - points reduced from 10 to 5.
- l. 4.2d – Added Question here as in New Project Scorecard:

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]. A “yes” response to receive 0 points; a “no” response to receive 5 points.
- m. 4.2e – Added Question here as in New Project Scorecard:

Were any HMIS users deactivated due to lack of login compliance (every 60 days) during CY2022? [Data Center records]. A “yes” response to receive 0 points; a “no” response to receive 3 points.
- n. HUD Monitoring – 4.3b, general edit

Section V: Coordinated Entry and Prioritization

- o. 5.1 Staff suggested question addition to measure CE case conferencing participation due to some current issues with grantees not taking referrals from the CE system, which is required by HUD and the CoC. Question Added (same addition to New Project Scorecard in Agency’s Relationship to Community Section):

Does the agency participate in at least 85% of the Region’s case conferencing in calendar year 2022? [*CE Lead Interview*]
- p. 5.1 now numbered 5.2 – general edits, form clarification
- q. 5.2 now numbered 5.3 – general edits, form clarification

Section VI: Application Deadlines and Documentation – no changes

Sindy Connell made a motion to accept the revisions to the FY2023 New and Renewal Scorecards that the Scorecard Committee came to a consensus on and to recommend these Scorecards to the NC BoS CoC Steering Committee. Crystal Gwendo seconded the motion. All voted unanimously in favor. Motion approved.

Brian thanked Scorecard Committee members for volunteering their time and for their important feedback in this process. The FY2023 Scorecard Committee's work for this year is complete.