



## **Ad Hoc Scoring Committee**

### **Meeting Minutes**

**May 8, 2007**

**Present: Duncan Yetman (Town of Stratford), Michael McCarthy (The Work Place, Inc.) Paul Mendes (Mount Aery Baptist Church), Vicki Furey (Bridge House), Cecilia Baldwin (CARC)**

Meeting commenced at 9:20 AM at Catholic Charities Offices in Bridgeport.

Duncan indicated the main purpose of today's minutes is to provide technical notes for groups submitting applications to let them know where they stand in the process and the corrections that need to be made to their applications. It was noted that many of the applications were missing various pieces of information and forms. Mike kept track of scores on his laptop spreadsheet with which he brought a projector so that Committee members could see the scoring as we proceeded. Duncan asked Cecilia to take minutes.

Duncan took a moment to explain what had happened to Liberation Programs, Inc. application. They did not submit anything until May 7. They were not even aware of the need to submit a renewal application and monitoring documentation until contacted by Duncan on April 30. Duncan specifically told their staff that their application would not be scored because of the lack of time for review, but that he would review what they submitted to offer technical notes and corrections prior to their final submission on 5/25 and he invited other Committee members to do the same.

Before Mike arrived, the Committee began by scoring the only new application received, from Hall-Brooke Behavioral Health Services. After Mike arrived and got set-up, the group reviewed applications in the following order as presented in Mike's spreadsheet (numbers in parentheses refer to last four digits of current HUD grant number for applicants with multiple applications):

Hall-Brooke (3003)  
Hall-Brooke (3009)  
Hall-Brooke (3001)  
ABRI  
Emerge, Inc.  
Career Resources  
Catholic Charities  
Micah (3005)  
Micah (3007)  
The Connection, Inc.  
ReFocus  
Regional Network of Programs (RNP)  
UWEFC – HMIS  
S+C TRA  
S+C PRA

All Committee members adopted the scores provided by Mike on the following categories

- **A. Clients Served,**
- **B. Client Outcomes,**
- **D. Staffing: Staff to Client Ratio,**
- **I. HMIS Compliance, and**
- **K. Cost/Leveraging**

as they were scored directly from the responses on the APRs provided, by performing calculations on leveraging amounts, or by performing calculations on number served and total budget amounts. These scores were double-checked by Duncan. Mike collected from each Committee member their scores for the remaining categories before totaling up the score for each project and moving to the next applicant in the order listed above. All projects were scored on a 100 point scale except for the following applicants, whose scores were prorated by dividing their total score by the number of points indicated for each to arrive at a percentage figure:

- Hall-Brooke (3001), 90 points, no monitoring conducted
- S+C TRA and PRA, 78 points, staff ratios, monitoring, and cost effectiveness are not applicable, Applicant did not submit a full set of the requested documentation, Committee agreed to adopt Duncan's scores for this applicant
- RNP, 74 points, has not yet submitted an APR
- UWEFC-HMIS, 30 points, most scoring categories were not applicable, Committee agreed to uniformly adopt Duncan's scores for this applicant

The final scores can be found on the attached spreadsheet. Total scores were not calculated and presented to the Committee until after the meeting. To handle the situation of breaking tied scores, Duncan proposed to the Committee by email that the group consider next the total raw scores on Categories A, B, and C because these categories are directly related to project performance. The Committee agreed.

*During consideration of the applications, the Committee made the following general technical notes about applications.*

### **General Notes**

HUD has issued an addendum to the NOFA amending the **Logic Model**. All grantees are to submit a Logic Model using the revised form found at <http://www.hud.gov/offices/adm/grants/nofa07/grpcoc.cfm>

The HUD Program Name is automatically filled in on this year's Logic Model, but the "Component Name" has to be filled in by the applicant. HUD does not provide any real guidance as to what should go here, but Part B, section b. of the Exhibit 2, "Component Types" provides a clue. So to be consistent, agencies should designate their projects one of the following component names in the Logic Model:

- SHP-PH (for permanent housing)
- SHP-TH (for transitional housing)
- SHP-HMIS (for HMIS)
- S+C-TRA (for tenant-based rental assistance)
- S+C-PRA (for project-based rental assistance)

Many applicants did not transfer data correctly from their latest APR to Section H. Renewal Performance of the Exhibit 2. In some cases numbers were wrong or the *entry* numbers were used in Question 5 instead of the *exit* numbers. Many applicants also failed to use the new SF-424 form as found on HUD's Continuum of Care NOFA website and left many categories on that form blank. The Exhibit 2 is a Microsoft Word document that can be edited, so as much as possible, applicants are asked to add rows to charts to fill in all their information in the charts provided.

*Specific technical notes, peculiar to each application, will be sent separately by email to each applicant.*

Duncan mentioned that tomorrow's Steering Committee meeting has been postponed as it was too soon to get all the information from today's meeting together to present to the Committee for ranking. It will be held on Wednesday, May 16 at 9:30. He explained that he would review the minutes from Cecilia, revise and send them out to the Scoring Committee for review, and, once the majority of Steering Committee members approved the minutes, forward them onto the Steering Committee for their consideration and determination of ranking order. The Steering Committee would then forward the proposed Project Priority List, their ranking of projects, to a special Continuum Plenary meeting on May 23<sup>rd</sup> for approval.

Meeting adjourned at 12:45 PM.

Respectfully submitted by

Cecilia Baldwin  
CARC