



North Carolina Balance of State Continuum of Care

bos@ncceh.org

919.755.4393

www.ncceh.org/BoS

BoS Scorecard Committee Meeting 5.17.17

Attendance

Committee Members: Monica Frizzell, Tameka Gunn, Kristen Martin, Tonette Latham, Reeshema Walker, Michele Knapp, Candice Rountree, Sabra Rock

NCCEH Staff: Brian Alexander, Ehren Dohler, Nancy Holochwost

FY2017 CoC Competition Overview

- The CoC Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) has not been released by HUD yet, so many details regarding the application are not yet known. The CoC registration notice, which was released on April 10, provides some information about the competition.
- HUD has indicated that CoCs will continue to be required to rank all project applications and place them into two tiers. This ranking is based on their performance and HUD's and the CoC's priorities.
 - Based on past competitions, projects placed in Tier 1 are generally safe; projects placed in Tier 2 are not guaranteed funding. Therefore, the projects' scores and ranking affect their potential to be funded.
- The CoC registration notice indicated that there will be three types of projects eligible for new/bonus funding: rapid re-housing, permanent supportive housing, and a new project type that is joint rapid re-housing and transitional housing.
- BoS staff submitted the CoC registration to HUD in April. The Grant Inventory Worksheet (GIW), which lists all grants eligible for renewal, has been submitted to HUD and will be finalized by HUD headquarters no earlier than June 9.
- The release of the NOFA will open the CoC competition.
 - BoS staff anticipate that the NOFA will be released in June (after the GIW is finalized).
 - The NOFA will provide details of available funding for this year's competition, including:
 - New and bonus projects
 - Eligible activities
 - HUD's priorities for funding and HUD's process for scoring CoCs

Introduction to the Scorecard

- The BoS scorecard has 4 main goals:
 - Fund organizations that have the capacity to run effective programs (administrative/management capacity, can operate on reimbursement basis, have experience serving homeless populations)
 - Fund projects that reflect the BoS CoC's priorities and HUD's priorities (providing permanent housing, ending chronic homelessness, ending veteran homelessness)
 - Incentivize agencies to be good partners (using HMIS, participating in Regional Committee and coordinated assessment)

- Ensure that funded projects are being good stewards of BoS CoC funding and are performing to BoS CoC standards
- There are two scorecards, one for renewal projects and one for new projects. Each scorecard has two parts:
 - Part 1: Combined Scoring
 - This section is scored by NCCEH staff and a member of the Project Review Committee
 - The two scores are averaged to determine the final score for this section
 - Part 2: Staff Scoring
 - This section is scored by NCCEH staff only
 - This section focuses on objective technical questions and performance (information pulled from APRs and HMIS data)
 - The scores for Part 1 and Part 2 are added together to create the final score for the project.
- After scoring the project applications, the Project Review Committee creates a ranked list of projects, which is provided to the Steering Committee for its review and approval. The ranking may be based on:
 - Scores
 - Meeting scorecard minimums, standards, and thresholds
 - Lateness of application materials
 - Eligibility of the project

FY2016 Scoring Overview

- In the 2016 competition, 43 renewal projects were submitted.
 - Forty-two of them were scored by the Project Review Committee. The other renewal project was the BoS HMIS grant, which historically has been ranked first because HMIS is necessary for all projects to be able to operate within HUD's requirements.
- Five new projects were submitted.
 - Two rapid re-housing projects did not complete the application by the deadline and were ineligible to be put forward.
 - Two permanent supportive housing projects and one rapid re-housing project were put forward.
- In addition, the BoS CoC submitted an application for a CoC planning grant. HUD does not required CoC planning grants to be scored or ranked.
- The project ranking played a role in which projects were funded in the 2016 competition. The CoC's overall score (based on the CoC-wide application) also affects the likelihood of project applications being funded or not.
- The BoS CoC requested \$1,077,732 in Tier 2 and it received \$967,732. The project that was ranked last in Tier 2, a rapid re-housing project in Pitt County, was not funded.
- The project application scores in the 2016 competition ranged from a low of 18.5 to a high of 148.
 - The highest PSH score was 148 and the lowest was 18.5, out of a possible 208.
 - The highest RRH score was 99.5 and the lowest was 43, out of a possible 197.

Previous Scorecards

- Each section of the scorecard has a minimum score that project applications must meet.
 - If the minimum score is not met, further review is triggered. The Project Review Committee has the discretion to determine the consequences. In past competitions, applications that did not meet minimums have been ranked lower in the project priority list.



- In the 2016 competition, minimums were not met in two of the seven scorecard sections.
 - CoC Priorities: ratio of housing funds to services funds (CoC prioritizes using funds for housing)
 - 10 applications did not meet the minimum
 - Project Performance: populations served, program outcomes, data quality, and spending rates
 - 9 applications did not meet the minimum (of these, 3 did not have an APR to score)
- Some questions on the scorecard are “standards,” which are elements all projects are expected to meet.
 - Instead of receiving points for these questions, applications receive a score of met, unmet, unmet-documentation not provided (if documentation needed to score this element was not submitted), or not applicable.
 - The Project Review Committee has used standards as part of the ranking process in past competitions. Applications that did not meet the following standards have been ranked lower in the project priority list:
 - PSH Key Elements
 - RRH Program Standards
 - Late applications
- Items on the 2016 renewal scorecard that were standards:
 - PSH Key Elements
 - Services funding plan (plan for how to reduce use of CoC funding for services)
 - Prioritizing chronically homeless beds in PSH projects
 - Match documentation
 - HUD monitoring findings
 - Full participation in coordinated assessment
 - Prioritizing target populations in PSH projects
 - Submitting application and documentation by CoC deadline
- Items on the 2016 new scorecard that were standards:
 - Project fits agency’s mission
 - Projects demonstrate they meet an existing need, supported by local data
 - Providing a statement justifying choosing leasing instead of rental assistance
 - RRH applicants have operated a RRH project previously (through ESG or other funds)
 - Services funding plan (plan for how to reduce use of CoC funding for services)
 - PSH Key Elements
 - RRH Performance Benchmarks and Program Standards
 - Capacity for services
 - Match documentation
 - For existing grantees: HUD monitoring findings and spending rates
 - Participation in Regional Committee meetings, presented application to committee, participated in ESG application process and coordinated assessment
- In the 2016 competition, the following standards were not met by all applicants: PSH Key Elements, RRH Program Standards, services funding plan, prioritizing PSH beds for chronically homeless people, and full participation in coordinated assessment.
 - There was significant improvement on applicants meeting the standards for PSH Key Elements and the services funding plan since the previous year’s competition.

Next Steps

- The Scorecard Committee is tasked with reviewing the existing scorecards and making any needed changes or adjustments for the 2017 competition.



- Possible changes include:
 - Adding new questions to incorporate new resources and information
 - Removing questions that are no longer asked on the project application or are no longer a priority
 - Changing questions from points to standards
 - Changing minimum scores
 - Updating language
- Committee members were asked for any questions or feedback.
 - Tameka asked how many applications are expected this year compared to last year.
 - Nancy noted that some renewal grants are consolidating, so there will be fewer renewal applications. At this time, nine eligible projects have submitted an Intent to Apply form for new projects. The total number of applications is expected to be slightly lower than last year.
- BoS staff will prep the scorecards prior to the committee's next meeting. This includes noting items that created issues last year, updating CoC priorities, and updating HUD's priorities.
 - Staff will track changes so that committee members can easily see the notations.
 - The scorecards will be sent to committee members by next Thursday, May 25.
- The Scorecard Committee will meet Tuesday, May 30, from 9:00 to 12:00 to discuss and finalize updates to the 2017 scorecards.

