

HUD CoC NOFA Local Application
Rationale for Changes to 2016 Process

Metric	Pt. Value 2015	Pt. Value 2016	Talking Points for Presenters
Primary Activity Type	16	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In prior rounds, only PSH projects could score full points, while all other project types could only score few or zero points. • Is not a performance – based metric • PSH and RRH lost out on 11 automatic points, and no longer had a large advantage over all other project types. • This did seem to be a significant reason for scoring and ranking shifts.
HUD Priorities	8	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was called Target Populations in 2016, and was a sub-question in a larger section of HUD priorities. • Is reflective of HUD emphasis on target populations. • Was not responsible for any major swings in scores for any projects.
Using Housing 1 st Approach	6	10	Was part of the HUD Priorities section in 2016. Community is committed to operating on a Housing 1 st / Low Barrier model. More backup documentation was also required this year, which added weight to the score. This question requires narrative response, and is scored by the NOFA Committee. This year backup documentation was considered in evaluation of the narrative response and projects lost points if the narrative and backup documentation did not match.
Cost Effectiveness	N/A	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HUD explicitly mentions this metric as a priority (2016 HUD CoC NOFA, pg. 8, section 2a). As a result, it was added in 2016. • Demonstrates effective use of HUD funds.
Outcome Performance	38	32	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Since there are no consistently low performing projects in the package, weight on these metrics could be shifted to focus on other areas such as grant management, fiscal management, cost effectiveness, and Utilization. • Some projects saw individual score swings because of their performance. Lowering the total point value of performance did not cause shifts in ranking.
Spending	12	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The community acknowledged that while underspending was an issue, the underlying causes have been identified. • The issue overall needs to be addressed by a system-wide strategy at the funder level. • The shift in weight actually helped those projects who were penalized more harshly for underspending in 2015.
Reports and Invoicing	N/A	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explicitly mentions this metric in the NOFA (p. 26, section 2.d.(1)) as a threshold requirement for all renewal projects.

HUD CoC NOFA Local Application
Rationale for Changes to 2016 Process

Proof of Eligibility	N/A	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meant to weight projects compliance with low barrier. • Narrative showed proof of good grant management as evidenced by claims in the Policy and Procedure Documentation.
Utilization	N/A	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is explicitly mentioned in the NOFA as a factor that should be scored. • Very few projects earned full points on this metric.
HMIS Data Completeness Report Card	2	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change to score
Fiscal Management	N/A	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was scored in 2015 as part of quality assurance, though audits were submitted during that funding round. More projects than anticipated had findings in their audits, and the NOFA committee felt weight should be put on this item. • It was not a major factor in scoring shifts.
Quality Assurance	12	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fiscal management and quality assurance were score as a single factor in 2015 and as two distinct factors in 2016. • Changing this scoring allowed for points to be put into items such as Proof of Eligibility. • Projects in all parts of the package (top, middle, bottom) scored low on this metric. It was not a driver in where a project landed in the package.
Leverage	3	N/A	Was no longer required in 2016. HUD no longer scores it either.
Completeness	3	N/A	Was not scored in 2016. There were not generally issues of incomplete applications being submitted, and any missing items would be reflected in scoring through other elements of the application.
Total Points Possible	100	100	N/A