



North Carolina Balance of State Continuum of Care

bos@ncceh.org

919.755.4393

www.ncceh.org/BoS

BoS Scorecard Committee Meeting 5.30.18

Attendance

Committee Members: Melissa Eastwood, Monica Frizzell, Richard Gary, Tameka Gunn, Angela Jones, Tereka McCollum, Lisa Phillips, Micky Robinson, Robert Williams

NCCEH Staff: Denise Neunaber, Ben Bradley, Brian Alexander, Ehren Dohler, Jenn Von Egidy

FY2018 CoC Competition Overview

- 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.
 - We have 35 renewals grants
 - 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.
 - 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 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 and the Grant Inventory worksheet are complete, and we are awaiting HUD confirmation.
- 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 NC BoS CoC's priorities and HUD's priorities (providing permanent housing, serving defined subpopulations – in the past these have been chronically homeless individuals and families and homeless Veterans)
 - Incentivize agencies to be good partners (agencies who participate in community efforts to end homelessness, participate in HMIS, help create infrastructure for their community's homeless service system to operate effectively throughout the year)

- Ensure that funded projects are being good stewards of NC BoS CoC funding and are performing to NC 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.
- Four Key Categories of the Scorecard:
 - Thresholds- Must be met to continue in the competition
 - Standards- Should be met and may be reason not to fund
 - Minimums- Minimum number of points required in a section or a review is triggered
 - Scores- How many points the project received compared to the possible points for the section
- 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:
 - Eligibility of the project
 - Lateness of application materials
 - Funding Priorities
 - Meeting scorecard minimums, standards, and thresholds
 - Scores

FY2017 Scoring Overview

- In the 2017 competition, 33 renewal projects were submitted.
 - Thirty-two of them were scored by the Project Review Committee. The other renewal project was the NC BoS CoC HMIS grant, which historically has been ranked first because HMIS is necessary for all projects to be able to operate within HUD's requirements.
- Eight new projects were scored out of nine submitted.
 - One rapid re-housing project did not complete the application by the deadline and was ineligible to be put forward.
 - One permanent supportive housing projects and six rapid re-housing projects were put forward.
 - One SSO-CE project was submitted that covers the CoC.
 - HUD does not require CoC planning grants to be scored or ranked.
- The project ranking played a role in which projects were funded in the 2017 competition. The CoC's overall score (based on the CoC-wide application) also affects the likelihood of project applications being funded or not.
- Awarded \$159,767 for the SSO-Coordinated Entry grant in Tier 1.
- The NC BoS CoC was awarded \$376,902 in Tier 2. No new projects were funded in Tier 2. Three new RRH projects were ranked at the bottom of Tier 2.
- The project application scores in the 2017 competition ranged from a low of 58 to a high of 151.
 - The highest PSH score was 151 and the lowest was 58, out of a possible 200.



- The highest RRH score was 88 and the lowest was 76, out of a possible 182.

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 2017 competition, minimums were not met in 3 sections
 - Section 2: Program Design
 - Section 3: NC BoS CoC Design
 - Section 4: Project Performance
 - RTSA project missed two minimums in FY17 and was not funded.
 - Sections 2 and 3
 - Scored 2.5 points out of 38 total points
- Some questions on the scorecard are “standards,” for both new and renewal scorecards.
 - 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 and uses precedent.
 - Housing First
 - PSH Key Elements
 - RRH Performance Benchmarks and Program Standards
- Items on the 2017 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 PSH projects
 - Submitting application and documentation by CoC deadline
- Possible changes for FY 2018
 - Adding new questions to incorporate new resources and information
 - Taking away questions that are no longer asked on application or not a priority
 - Changing questions from points to standards
 - Changing minimums, if necessary
 - Updating language

Next Steps

- The Scorecard Committee is tasked with reviewing the 2017 new and renewal scorecards and making any needed changes or adjustments for the 2018 competition.
- Staff will draft FY2018 scorecards and send to members.
- Committee members were asked for any questions or feedback.
 - Lisa Phillips does not have any questions but stated the orientation was thorough and laid a good groundwork for the duties of the committee.
- Next Meeting: Tuesday, June 6th 11:00am-1:00pm

