

**Scoring Committee
Minutes
April 18, 2007**

Present: Duncan Yetman (Town of Stratford) Vicki Furey (Bridge House); Michael McCarthy (The WorkPlace Inc.); Margaret Peabody (RNP), Cecilia Baldwin (CARC)

Meeting commenced at 1.10pm

Duncan informed the group that Letticia had removed herself from the Scoring Committee because she will be assisting Catholic Charities with their application process.

Margaret said she also needed to excuse herself from this committee due to a conflict of interest; Regional Network of Programs (RNP) will be submitting an application. It would not be fair for her to remain on the committee. This committee will now consist of five members: Duncan, Michael, Vicki, Judy and Cecilia. Cecilia reminded those present that there was discussion at the last meeting to invite Rose Christy from the City of Bridgeport to assist with scoring the applications. It was mentioned that the City of Bridgeport may be submitting applications on behalf of a couple of sponsors so she may not be available to participate on the committee. Duncan may approach Paul Mendes to be on this committee.

It is anticipated there will be 16 applications if Shelter plus Care submits their renewals. If they do not, there will only be 14. **Applications are due April 27 at the United Way and they will be scored during the week of May 7th.** Duncan said there may be 2 brand new applications. One would probably be from Hall Brooke. He could not recall which agency was submitting the other application for a new project. There could be as many as 18 applications to be scored this year, most of which would be renewals.

Vicki asked which definition of homelessness was the scoring committee to use when reviewing the applications. Duncan indicated the definition was included in the application packet. HUD's definition of chronically homeless and unaccompanied individuals applies. As far as he is concerned, all the renewal applications will qualify as serving the homeless. Michael read the HUD's definition of homelessness. Vicki asked that these definitions be available on the date chosen to score the applications.

Duncan handed out a black lined copy of an application for the committee to get an idea of what to look for when scoring. In the section regarding budgets, Duncan indicated we needed to look for the number of full time equivalents in the operating budget the applicant has applied for and compare with the project budget to determine if they are making the staff/client ratio. He also mentioned there will be an additional line on this budget for the totals which will take a lot of the work out of it.

Duncan will seek clarification in assessing cost effectiveness/leveraging (section K) regarding how DMHAS \$9500 standard is defined. Committee members were confused about whether this figure referred to actual units or cost per individual.

Michael proposed compiling an Excel spreadsheet to plug the numbers in. When he has completed his section, he will distribute the applications to the rest of the committee to score.

Vicki asked if we need to consider Fair Market Rent (FMR) for this process. It was stated that FMR doesn't really affect this process. Vicki felt it would be helpful to have the current FMR available.

Michael asked about the status of the Ranking Committee and what role they would play in this year's screening process. Duncan informed him that the Ranking Committee would not be part of the process this year. This year, members of Standards and Evaluations and the Ranking Committee decided it would be appropriate for ranking to be done by the Steering Committee.

After the applications are scored, they will be presented to the Steering Committee who may or may not decide to rank the applications in the order in which they were scored. Concerns were voiced about the need for the Steering Committee to be impartial to the applications they were reviewing. It would not be fair for a member of the Steering Committee to review applications from their own agency, it's possible a member would want to change the ranking of a particular application. One way to alleviate that would be to ask members to remove themselves from the room when their application is being ranked.

Duncan expressed the need for the group to become familiar with the logic model. He states he believes HUD may be using the model to develop a series of benchmarks and standards to rate programs if they do not reach certain levels. It is possible that programs could be de-funded if their performance continues to be poor. Vicki asked if there was any correlation between the Annual Program Report (APR) and the logic model. Duncan indicated there was little correlation as the logic model has changed every year for the last three years.

The question of applying penalties to late applications was raised and discussed briefly. There really is no reason for applications to be late since each agency received the notice at the same time and all are aware of the time frame by which they have to turn in their applications. GBACoC has created its own deadline in order for applications to be scored and ranked before the HUD deadline of June 8. Although late submissions hinder the review process it was decided that late applications will not be penalized this year. Renewal applications are held harmless and will get funded.

Michael will pull data for the APR to score sections A, B, D, I & K on the Renewal Scoring Sheet. The committee will score sections E, F, G, H & J.

Michael will pick up the applications on April 27, from Judy Sklarz at the United Way and he will deliver them to the Scoring Committee after he has pulled the information for the above mentioned sections. He will get his scores to other committee members before May 8th.

The Scoring Committee will meet from 9am – 2p on Tuesday, May 8th at Catholic Charities to score.
Meeting adjourned at 2.30pm

Respectfully Submitted

Cecilia Baldwin
Manager QA & TA
CARC