

MAY 2, 2022

PROPOSED CHANGES TO LOCAL COMPETITION SCORING TOOLS

This memorandum outlines proposed changes to the new and renewal CoC project scoring tools and project review process. The proposals below were reviewed and discussed at two LHCB Funding Committee meetings held on March 17, and April 21, 2022. The proposed changes are intended to improve alignment with HUD guidance and priorities, increase transparency, and eliminate redundancy.

Proposed changes to the New Project and Renewal Project Scoring Tools:

- Required attendance measured at Data Strategy Workgroup meetings will replace LHCB Meeting attendance.
- Low Barrier measure will retire elements concerning drug testing, too little income, and active substance abuse – all projects consistently compliant.
- Low Barrier measure replaces criminal background checks with Megan’s Law checks.
- Coordinated Entry measure indefinitely paused, until data source becomes reliable. Points shifted to Client Input measure to emphasize increased HUD priority.
- Past Performance measures removed from *New Project Scoring Tool* for fairness.
- All references to “project policies and procedures” removed from *New Project Scoring Tool* so as not to create unnecessary burden on new agencies applying for their first time.

The *Local CoC Competition Review, Rank & Appeals Process* document was reviewed for consistency with Scoring Tool updates. No substantive changes were made, with exception for relevant dates.

IMPACT OF PROPOSED CHANGES ON MAXIMUM SCORES

The following illustrates how the proposed changes will impact scores in the renewal and new scoring tools. *New Project Scoring Tool* removal of Agency Background/Capacity allowed for redistribution of points to other local community and HUD priorities across other sections.

Renewal Scoring Tool

Factor	Current Maximum Score	Proposed 2022 Maximum Score
Program Performance and Client Outcomes	55	55
Finances, Administration, and Compliance	45	45
Maximum Points Available	100	100

New Scoring Tool

Factor	Current Maximum Score	Proposed 2022 Maximum Score
Program Description	26	30
Mainstream Resources	5	10
Agency Background/Capacity	27	0
Budget and Cost-Effectiveness	22	20
Cultural Competency	12	25
Disability Access	8	15
Maximum Points Available	100	100

SAN FRANCISCO LOCAL HOMELESS COORDINATING BOARD

SCORING TOOL PROPOSALS IN DETAIL

HUD PRIORITY: INCREASED EMPHASIS ON CLIENT INPUT

2A, 2G – CLIENT FEEDBACK SCORING POINT INCREASE; INDEFINITE PAUSE OF COORDINATED ENTRY MEASURE

Funding Committee declined to implement proposed client survey. Client survey will be put to working group for continued development, with goal of implementation in 2023's local competition.

Coordinated Entry measure placed on an indefinite pause while HSH, Homebase, and Bitfocus work to refine measured elements and reliability of data sources.

For 2022 NOFO, surplus of 4 points from indefinitely paused Coordinated Entry measure are shifted to 2a to increase emphasis on Client Input, in accordance with HUD's stated priorities, and as a placeholder for assignment of points to client survey, once launched in a future competition.

HUD PRIORITY: EMPHASIZING OBJECTIVE MEASURES

2D – COC PARTICIPATION NOW EXAMINES DATA STRATEGY WORKGROUP, IN PLACE OF LHCB MEETING ATTENDANCE

Expanding objective basis for scoring precludes self-reporting of attendance at CoC-related meetings. Attendance is now measured by taking roll during meetings.

LHCB meetings are required by Brown Act to remain as public and accessible as possible, precluding registration requirements.

Data Strategy Workgroup (DSW) meetings occur on the same frequency as LHCB meetings and are a newly-required CoC-related meeting. DSW meetings will replace LHCB meetings on the list of required meetings in Factor 2D.

LOCAL PRIORITY: EASING ACCESSIBILITY TO NEW AGENCIES APPLYING FOR COC FUNDING

ELIMINATE FORMER *NEW PROJECT SCORING TOOL*, §3

Former Section 3 of the New Project Scoring Tool requested extensive data and narratives related to past comparable project performance. Unfamiliar agencies applying for their first CoC funding were at an inherent disadvantage, compared to those already operating with CoC funding.

Furthermore, a paradox was created where familiar agencies might have data reflecting poor performance, then competing with unfamiliar agencies with no meaningful performance data; which project is 'better'?

Eliminating Section 3 allowed for redistribution of point values toward other stated HUD and local priorities found in other sections of the *New Project Scoring Tool*.

REMOVED REFERENCE TO POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

New Project Scoring Tool made repeated reference to policies and procedures, which implied that a new project applicant need already have such documents in place. This created an unnecessary bar to entry for unfamiliar agencies.

All references to policies and procedures now replaced with generic 'design' terminology. Projects are instead encouraged to treat narratives written for local application process as a drafting exercise toward eventual policies and procedures, should the project be awarded by HUD.