BoS Scorecard Committee Meeting
May 8, 2020 at 2 PM

Attendance
Committee Members: Nina Walker, Joey Wilson, Sheryl Cox, Angela Harper King, Garth Frieling, LaTonya Penny, Arwen March

NCCEH Staff: Brian Alexander, Ehren Dohler, Jenn Von Egidy, Debra A. Susie, Kevin McNamee

Background
- Prior to the meeting, committee members were provided with copies of the 2019 new and renewal CoC applicant scorecards.
- Staff created a draft, documenting potential updates through tracked changes. Staff projected the draft with tracked changes for committee members to see during the meeting.
- NC BoS CoC staff and committee members reviewed the proposed changes in detail.

2019 Scorecards Overview
Staff gave an overview of the renewal and new CoC applicant scorecards and each of the scoring sections within. 2019 scorecards are posted on the NCCEH website:
- [New](New)
- [Renewal](Renewal)

Review of Renewal Scorecard Proposed Changes
Staff did an initial review of the scorecards prior to the meeting and added suggested changes to the scorecard via track changes in a draft 2019 Renewal Scorecard. Staff reviewed all sections of the Renewal Scorecard, except for Sections V and VI. Staff devoted the last 10 minutes of the meeting to discuss on the addition of racial equity questions to the application for the first time this year. Coordinated Entry and Prioritization and Application Deadlines and Documentation will be reviewed during the next meeting along with a first review of the new CoC applicant scorecard.

Section I: General Application
- Accuracy and Appropriateness of Responses
  Waiting for the release of the NOFA, this section will need to be revisited to determine if the sections Project Review Committee members will review are still relevant or need updating.

Section II: Program Design
Here as well, minimums for whether standards are met may need to be updated here and throughout once/if the NOFA is released.
- Housing First
  2.1: Does this project use a Housing First approach? Must meet all statements below to meet standard. Program should not have any policies that would result in screening out or terminating anyone for any of the reasons below, but policies do not have to explicitly include the statements below to meet the standard.
A sample lease was added to the list of documents needed for review. Both 2.1a and b should be included. IF unmet or documentation not provided, it should be noted why.

2.1a: Does the project ensure that participants are not screened out based on the following:
- Having too little or no income
- Active or history of substance abuse
- Having a criminal record (with exceptions for state mandated restrictions)
- History of domestic violence (e.g. lack of protective order, or separation from abuser, or law enforcement involvement)

2.1b: Does the project ensure that participants are not terminated from the program for the following reasons:
- Failure to participate in supportive services
- Failure to make progress on a service plan
- Loss of income or failure to improve income
- Domestic violence
- Any other activity not covered in a lease agreement typically found in the project’s geographic area

Angela Harper King asked for more clarity on the last bullet in 2.1b regarding “other activity,” and Jenn Egidy gave examples, like neighborhood association rules.

2.2: This language was deleted entirely.
If this project is a permanent supportive housing project, does it include the following key elements of permanent supportive housing as defined by the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA)? This statement was removed to provide clarity for scorers during the competition.

2.4: Services Resource Leverage Plan
The total 10 points for this section were broken out into two 5-point increments to allow a range of points for programs that met some but not all of these:
- It currently has formal relationships with another agency (at least MOUs or MOAs in place) or a dedicated funding stream to provide some services for program participants that are funded by another source besides CoC program funds.
- Services provided by other funding sources exceed the required 25% match.
We will ensure the applicant instructions include asking for proof from grantees for these bullets (so they know to turn it in).

Angela Harper King asked if the 5 and 5 break-out is part of overall scoring and not extra? Ehren Dohler confirmed that it was not extra but part of the overall score, and it could pull programs up the scoring list if they have these in place.

2.5: Permanent Supportive Housing: Moving-on Strategy
Similarly, the total 15 points here were broken up into an additional increment of 10 points for meeting 4-5 of the bulleted points below:
• Regular evaluation using standardized criteria to identify households who may be interested and able to move on;
• A formal partnership with one or more affordable housing providers (like a public housing authority/HCV organization);
• A method to prepare tenants to move-on and exit planning procedures;
• A method to link moving-on tenants to mainstream services and supports;
• Procedures to provide step-down services after exit; and
• A strategy to evaluate the effectiveness of moving-on strategies.

Joey Wilson asked: What would happen to the participants of a PSH program if a particular program becomes defunded by HUD? Brian Alexander responded that the Project Review Committee looks at many things when defunding PSH programs because it can put households at-risk of homelessness. They look at the other resources in the community including other PSH programs that might be able to assist to house or take over subsidies and services. There are three main things that might happen to households in these defunded programs: 1) They can transition to another PSH program that covers the same geographic area and have slots open; 2) they can move to other income-based housing such as public housing or section 8; or 3) PSH rental assistance/services stop and the household maintains on their own. We encourage defunded programs to work closely with these households while still in operation to figure out the best option that can maintain stability in housing.

Section III: NC BoS CoC Priorities
There was discussion about dissolving this section and incorporating it within Program Design. The insertion of LGBTQ as a subpopulation was discussed. Angela Harper King raised the challenges of the hearing-disabled along with the English-as-a-second-language (ESL) subpopulation for whom mechanisms for interpreters could be included. Ehren Dohler suggested we may not be able to target those populations but could allocate points in a different section that could later become standards over time, so programs are ready for them.

Section IV: Project Performance
4.1i: What percentage of adults gained or increased total cash income? [CoC-APR 19a3]
We need to rethink the income questions for this year, maybe separating earned from unearned income. TBD.

4.1k: PSH projects: What percentage of program participants remained in the program for 6 months or longer? [CoC-APR 22a1]
This section was deleted and its points redistributed between 4.1c and 4.1l because it is no longer relevant given how the majority of applicants are commonly scoring the full 10 points.

4.3b and 4.3c: The latter was incorporated into 4.3b,
Previous Project Spending Rates: These questions are for projects that have been operating for at least one year at the time of the NOFA release. (percentage rounded to the nearest whole number)
Percentage 90% or higher
(Projects that fall below the standard will trigger review by CoC staff and Project Review Committee. The review will determine potential consequences, including whether some funding should be reallocated to new projects). [Scored from APR. If APR is not available, agencies will submit an e-LOCCS screenshot of final draw for last completed year. If agencies are spending less than 90% of funding, they must submit a narrative explaining why the agency is underspending their grant].
Next steps
Staff proposed the addition of a fourth meeting on May 29th dedicated to a considered discussion of the Racial Equity Subcommittee’s recommendation as to which questions should be included into the scorecards. Subcommittee members agreed to add this additional meeting.

NEXT MEETING: May 15, 2:00-3:30 pm