



System Impact Committee

Recommendations to Performance Measures Workgroup

Homebase facilitated a comprehensive discussion on ways the System Impact Committee could inform improvements to the CoC NOFO scoring tool. The discussion focused on comparing Alameda's scoring framework to those from San Francisco, Napa, Marin, and Solano, and generating feedback for the CoC Standards, Compliance, and Funding Committee, the Performance Measures Workgroup, and the NOFO Workgroup.

Table of Contents

- Scoring Tool Comparison Highlights: 1**
- Committee Recommendations and Feedback: 2**
 - Client Voice:2
 - Utilization Scoring:2
 - Innovation Category:2
 - Community Impact and Collaboration:2
 - Capacity Building and Equity in Competition:2
 - Equity Scoring Support:3
- Additional Themes Raised: 3**
- Follow-up Action Items: 3**

Scoring Tool Comparison Highlights:

- **Alameda:** Structured and rigorous tool with clear benchmarks, integrated HMIS data, and a unified 16-point equity/client voice scoring rubric.
- **San Francisco:**
 - Implements incremental/tiered scoring (e.g., projects receive partial credit based on performance even if below the target).
 - Separates equity scoring from client voice; client input is measured through a participant survey administered by Homebase (not the provider).
 - Recognizes system engagement and operational collaboration.
 - Uses client-facing surveys during the NOFO process, with feedback reviewed independently by Homebase staff.
- **Napa:**
 - Uses separate tools for RRH and PSH.
 - Weights scoring differently by project type to account for differences in expected outcomes (e.g., lower return-to-homelessness weight for PSH).
 - Emphasizes cultural responsiveness and innovation.



System Impact Committee

- **Marin and Solano:**

- Simpler, less structured tools with limited performance thresholds.
- Members encouraged to review write-ups for additional insights.

Committee Recommendations and Feedback:

Client Voice:

- Strong consensus for scoring client voice separately from equity.
- Several members expressed that Alameda's combined scoring may dilute the importance of direct feedback from participants.
- Interest in developing and scoring a participant-facing survey modeled after San Francisco's approach.
- Acknowledged importance of anonymous data collection and routing survey feedback through Homebase.

Utilization Scoring:

- Committee discussed current utilization rates hovering at ~80% across many programs.
- Recommendation to assign more weight to utilization in the scoring tool.
- Suggested linking scoring to improvement targets or trends over time.

Innovation Category:

- Broad enthusiasm for a new scoring section rewarding creative and high-impact practices that exceed contract requirements.
- Members suggested this could surface replicable best practices.

Community Impact and Collaboration:

- Committee recommended adding a criterion recognizing programs that leverage non-CoC-funded partnerships to support HUD-funded work.
- Examples shared included libraries, schools, CalAIM/ECM providers, and private educational partnerships.
- Members cautioned that claims should be substantiated (e.g., MOU, letters from partners).

Capacity Building and Equity in Competition:

- Committee discussed the challenge faced by smaller providers or those with fewer grant-writing resources.
- Recommended capacity-building incentives and possible peer mentorship structures.
- Interest in allowing points for larger providers who support other agencies.



System Impact Committee Equity Scoring Support:

- Noted that while Alameda's equity rubric is strong, it may disadvantage smaller organizations or those unfamiliar with data analysis.
- Recommended companion resources: toolkit, application guide, sample responses, and technical assistance.

Additional Themes Raised:

- **Verification of Claims:** Interest in mechanisms to verify application claims via client voice or partner testimony.
- **Cross-Agency Learning:** Suggestion to use the scoring process to elevate successful strategies for community learning.
- **Geographic Expansion:** Committee asked to explore NOFO scoring tools from major cities beyond the Bay Area (e.g., LA, Portland, NYC).
- **International Resources:** Doris flagged the Canadian Homeless Learning Hub as a valuable model with training and tools.

Follow-up Action Items:

- Homebase will distribute a survey for committee members to provide further input on tool comparisons and recommendations.
- Detailed write-ups from each county comparison will be shared with the committee.
- A formal memo of recommendations will be developed for submission to the the CoC Standards, Compliance, and Funding Committee, the Performance Measures Workgroup, and the NOFO Workgroup.
- Continued exploration of capacity-building models and use of direct participant feedback in scoring will be included in future committee work.