BoS Scorecard Committee Meeting
May 15, 2020 at 2 PM

Attendance
Committee Members: Nina Walker, Joey Wilson, Sheryl Cox, Angela Harper King, Garth Frieling, Natasha Elliott

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

Ehren Dohler laid out a proposal for how to proceed with the scorecards, given the possibility HUD will issue a late NOFA or cancel the annual competition due to COVID-19. Committee members agreed to:

• Use the same new scorecard for 2020 with the addition of SSO-CE, TH-RRH, and RE questions.
• Not make any decisions for 2020 renewal scorecard (except to include some RE questions) until we see the NOFA
• Use the updates we have been reviewing to recommend 2021 new and renewal scorecards.

Ehren walked the committee through a review of the remainder of the renewal scorecard changes, picking up from the prior meeting and the 2019 scorecards (posted on the NCCEH website):

New Renewal

Renewal Scorecard Proposed Changes:

Section V
Coordinated Entry and Prioritization: Change assigned points.
• Asks if every new entry has a VI-SPDAT score and assigned it a 10-point value.

Comments by committee members
• Make it a standard
• Some clients refuse to cooperate, so less than 100% does not always reflect this and the client is still served.
• What about establishing a standard near 100% and identify where those refusals are recorded

Question to add: What percentage of new admissions in the last year have VI-SPDATs in HMIS. Make it 10 points.

New Scorecard Proposed Changes:

The Committee approved the addition of the following questions:

SSO-CE Questions to Add
• Program Design Section: Will the CE process funded in part by this grant cover the CoCs entire geographic area? [Proj. App. Sec. 3B, Q4A] STANDARD
• *Program Design Section:* Does the advertisement strategy ensure the CE process reaches survivors of DV with the highest barriers to access? [Proj. App. Sec. 3B, Q4C] STANDARD

• *Program Design Section:* Does the CE project indicate that it will tie into the existing NC BoS CoC CE system in each region? [Proj. App. Sec. 3B, Q4E] THRESHOLD

• *Program Design Section:* The budget maximizes funding for assessment of service needs, case management, and outreach services that increase access for DV survivors (assessment of service needs + CM + outreach / total budgeted amount)? [Proj. App. Sec. 6] 100-85% 15 pts; 84-50% 5 pts; below 50% 0 pts.

• *Program Design Section:* Does the project maximize the use of cash match versus in-kind match (cash match total / total match amount)? [Proj. App. Sec. 6] 100-75% 10 pts; 74-25% 5 pts; below 25% 0 pts

### TH-RRH Questions to Add

• *Program Design Section:* Does the New Project Form describe the TH portion of the project as bridge housing (regular (at least monthly) offers of PH placement, housing-focused services)? [New Project Form] NOTE: We will need to better define bridge housing STANDARD

• *Program Design Section:* Does the program adequately demonstrate that both TH and RRH are available to all participants when needed or desired? [Proj. App. Sec. 3B, Q1, Proj. App. Sec. 6] THRESHOLD

Natasha Elliott suggested that the realignment of points in section 6 needed more detail.

**Next steps**

If time allows, staff will send the Racial Equity Subcommittee’s recommendations in advance of the May 29th meeting.

**NEXT MEETING:** May 29, 1:00-2:30 pm