

**BoS Scorecard Committee Meeting**

**6.6.18**

**Attendance**

Committee Members: Melissa Eastwood, Monica Frizzell, Richard Gary, Bonnie Harper, Angela Jones, Tereka McCollum, Micky Robinson, Robert Williams

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

**Background**

* Prior to the meeting, committee members were provided with copies of the 2017 new and renewal scorecards.
* Staff has created a draft with proposed changes that are documented in tracked changes. The draft with the tracked changes was projected for the committee members to see during the meeting.
* NC BoS CoC staff and committee members reviewed the proposed changes in detail.

**Review of New Scorecard Proposed Changes**

Section II: Program Design

* Targeting to Prioritized Subpopulations

2.3: Deleted 2.3, as this information can be found in the Coordinated Entry section.

2.4: Revised this question to ask if the project has efficient flow to enter households into the

program quickly.

* Permanent Housing Projects

2.5: Monica stated that this information seems to just be informational and should be moved

towards the top of the application in General Application Information. This question will be

moved to the General Application section.

* Housing First

2.14: Revised this question to point the Project Review Committee member to look in the

Policies and Procedures only.

* PSH Projects Only: Key Elements of PSH
  + We added a guide post at the top of this section to include “PSH Projects Only” for the Project Review Committee member. Similar guideposts will be added throughout the scorecard to help direct the project reviewer.
  + Lisa Phillips wrote staff an email prior to this meeting, stating she wants to add a box for notes on the subjective and complicated questions. Staff agrees that we need to have a place for more information to be given to provide more details about why something was met, unmet, etc.

2.15: Changed PSH Key Elements and Benchmarks back to standards, and not Thresholds. We

will use future tense to reflect new projects that will be doing this in the future.

2.15b: Monica suggested we change the wording from “evicted” to “terminated” or “exited”

from the program. Brian stated that staff should provide layman’s terms for each of these.

Monica thinks this would work. Ehren stated that we would add this layman’s terms

explanation to the question instead of changing the standard. We want to add these

additional notes to every question, but we need to decide if the Scorecard Committee

will want to review these notes.

2.15i: Staff added a note to expand on this question and provide clarification. Notes will be

added to most questions to put jargon into layman’s terms.

* RRH Projects Only: Rapid Re-Housing Performance Benchmarks and Program Standards
  + We added a guide post at the top of this section to include “RRH Projects Only” for the Project Review Committee member. Similar guideposts will be added throughout the scorecard to help direct the reviewer.

2.16: Same as PSH, we decided to change thresholds back to standards and utilize future tense.

* Core Program Standard: Rent and Move-in Assistance

2.16b2 and 2.16b3: Staff plans to provide an example of how Policies and Procedures can be

both defined and flexible.

Section III: Scope of Services

* Service Needs

3.1: Monica stated the words “adequately and appropriately” are extremely subjective. Change

the questions to: “Does the applicant demonstrate they will meet the anticipated,

individual service needs of participant household and ensure they will find and maintain

permanent housing”. Directed the Project Review Committee member to look at application question 4A

question 2.

3.3: Because of the way this question is written, it singles out SOAR but doesn’t provide ideas

for other mainstream benefits. We could have multiple 1 point questions instead to include

other partnerships.

* + Tereka stated that including other examples could be
  + Monica worries that we would be penalizing those who do not have access to SOAR in their area. Brian stated it would be only a few points that are incentivizing, not penalizing. Ehren added that application wants us to incentivize SOAR.

Question is split into 2 questions, one to address mainstream benefits and one to address SOAR. Members agreed.

* HMIS/Comparable Database
  + Title of this section was changed to reflect comparable database can be used instead of HMIS, especially for DV agencies that are prohibited from using HMIS.

5.9: HUD is going to include RRH funding to DV survivors in this year’s CoC NOFA. We do not

know any details. DV providers are prohibited to enter data in HMIS, so we need to include

language to give that information so the question is friendly toward DV applicants.

Members decided that DV providers could get the 5 points, if they participated on the HIC.

5.10: Added a note that “This question does not apply to Victim Service Providers.” Members

decided to make a DV comparable database a threshold.

Section VI: Agency’s Relationship to Community

Participation in Regional Committee Activities

6.3: Last year, agencies who were going to meetings met the standard. We want to incentivize

those who participated in the process. Staff suggests giving points for participation and not

making it a standard. Members agreed giving points is better, and Brian suggests we don’t

make it more than 5 points. Members agreed.

6.4: We don’t have a way to assess this question. Monica suggested we ask them to submit

documentation of their CA process in their region. Members agreed that the applicant

should briefly describe how they are actively participating in CA.

6.5: Added the qualifier “actively” participate to the question to reflect that attending one

meeting does notmeet the Threshold. Staff will outline how this participation looks for

different project types.

Section V: Project Performance

* Monica worries the the scorecard currently incentivizes current CoC grantees because they only ask about the APR.
* Do we need to re-work this section: add questions or minimize section?
  + Bob states we should leave this section as is and incentivize current applicants.
  + Tereka stated she did not think she could give an opinion. Bonnie agreed she did not have enough knowledge to give an opinion.
* Staff will review the CAPER and the questions we are asking on the scorecard. We will follow up with the committee.

**Review of Renewal Scorecard Proposed Changes**

We ran out of time to review this scorecard. The committee decided to schedule a 3rd call to review the renewal Scorecard and make final recommendations for the Steering Committee.

**Next steps**

Staff will email the committee potential dates and times for a 3rd meeting to review the renewal scorecard.