



EveryOneHome

SIC and ESC Recommendations to CoC Standards,
Compliance, and Funding Committee on the NOFO Scoring
Tool

Summary of NOFO Scoring Tool Recommendations



How did the SIC Develop its Recommendations

Considering the updates to the performance measures developed by the Performance Measures Workgroup

Reviewing NOFO scoring tools from the following Bay Area CoCs to identify new and promising practices to enhance the Alameda CoC's Scoring tool:

- San Francisco
- Napa
- Marin
- Solano

Recapping Key Takeaways from SIC's Discussion of the NOFO Scoring Tool

The current scoring tool **bundles too many concepts together**, especially equity and client voice

Utilization scoring based on 80% threshold, scoring should look at improvements over time

There's no scoring for **creative or high-impact practices**

Smaller orgs are **disadvantaged by limited TA or grant writing capacity**

Cross-sector partnerships and mentorship aren't currently recognized

The process could elevate **cross-learning** and use **participant feedback** to verify claims

Client Voice

Summary of the SIC's Discussion:

- Combining client voice with equity **dilutes the importance of both**
- Alameda should consider a **standalone participant-facing survey**, similar to San Francisco
- Participants need a safe way to share feedback—**anonymous and independently managed**

Draft recommendation:

- Separate client voice scoring from equity
- Use an anonymous participant survey
- Incorporate the survey results directly into NOFO scoring

Utilization

Summary of the SIC's Discussion:

- Most projects are hovering around **80% utilization**—but still getting full credit
- Current scoring doesn't incentivize improvement or reward high-performing programs

Draft recommendation:

- Assign more weight to utilization
- Allow Programs to earn credit for meeting targets or improving over time

Community Impact and Collaboration

Summary of the SIC's Discussion:

- Programs are partnering with schools, CalAIM, and other sectors—but get no credit for it
- You want to see points for **non-CoC-funded collaboration**—with proof

Draft recommendation:

- Score partnerships with non-HUD-funded entities (e.g., libraries, healthcare, education)
- Require documentation (e.g., MOUs, letters from partners)

Capacity Building and Equity in Competition

Summary of the SIC's Discussion:

- Smaller orgs and grassroots providers are **at a disadvantage** under the current system
- There's interest in rewarding **mentorship** and providing **equity supports** like sample responses or guides

Draft recommendation:

- Develop technical assistance tools to help all orgs navigate the equity rubric
- Consider awarding points for larger orgs that provide peer mentorship or capacity-building

Innovation

Summary of the SIC's Discussion:

- Some programs are going above and beyond—but the scoring tool **doesn't recognize that**
- A new section could reward **creative or replicable practices** that exceed contract requirements

Draft recommendation:

- Create a new "innovation" scoring category
- Highlight programs piloting new models, bridging service gaps, or achieving unusual impact

Additional Themes Raised

Summary of the SIC's Discussion:

- **Application claims should be verifiable** through client voice or partner feedback
- There's interest in using the process to **elevate best practices** and encourage community learning

Draft recommendation:

- Build in claim verification tools (e.g., partner letters, client survey validation)
- Use high-scoring apps to support peer learning

ESC Feedback

Housing Measures

- The ESC emphasized the importance of regularly measuring project progress and sharing that information publicly so that the community is aware of how funds are being used and the impact being made.
- The ESC discussed how scoring and practices must account for nuanced outcomes, such as reunification with family or friends.

Capacity Building and Equity

- Given that smaller, grassroots, and BIPOC-led organizations are often at a disadvantage in funding competitions, the ESC suggests giving extra points to these types of organizations to address the imbalance. The ESC also encouraged deeper analysis of the specific barriers that smaller organizations face.

Innovation

- The ESC proposed accounting for how smaller and emerging organizations may be nimbler and better suited to innovate, whereas larger organizations often lack the flexibility and propensity for risk.
- The ESC highlighted the value of networking and social capital over organizational scale.
- The ESC suggested incentivizing the use of artificial intelligence (AI) as part of an innovation scoring factor provided that the use of AI does not perpetuate or exacerbate racial biases and disparities.