



BRISTOL COUNTY COC SELECTION STRATEGY.2025

Selection Process

In all cases, the Selection Process for considering projects includes a **threshold review** and a **merit review** arising from scoring of submitted applications/information. The process ends with the CoC's Performance Review Committee (PRC) presenting its recommended ranking to the Bristol County CoC (BCCC) membership and then voting for the final ranking of projects. A complete explanation of the CoC's Review and Ranking Procedures is available online at: <https://www.bristolcountycoc.com/2025-coc-funding-competition/>.

The scoring and ranking of projects is designed to ensure that:

- ❑ Ranking is objective and documented
- ❑ Performance and outcomes drive funding decisions
- ❑ Service participation and treatment integration influence scoring
- ❑ Transparent, merit-based review is conducted
- ❑ Local scoring is consistent with national outcome targets

All applicants are encouraged to demonstrate that they meet/exceed these objectives in their application/s.

The two major reviews conducted on each application shall be processed and scored as follows:

- **Threshold Review.** As the BCCC Collaborative Applicant, the City of New Bedford's Office of Housing & Community Development (OHCD) will complete the threshold review for all submitted applications to ensure all materials/required documentation is submitted in the application package. For projects meeting the Threshold Review, the OHCD will then provide all information necessary for scoring each application to the PRC¹. *Agencies that do not meet the threshold score or who are not recommended for funding or reduced funding may appeal and address the members of the COC PRC based only on these guidelines (agencies recommended or only partially funded are not eligible to request an appeal).*
- **Merit Review.** All applications will be evaluated and scored based on merit to ensure an objective, HMIS-driven methodology that aligns with HUD's System Performance measures. (New applications will not have the benefit of past program data and as such, scoring is proportionately adjusted.)

The merit review is being used to:

- ensure projects, and in turn, the CoC, demonstrate real, measurable performance (such as reducing unsheltered homelessness, reducing first-time homelessness, improving exits to permanent housing, etc.), and not just maintain existing projects.
- incentivize projects that combine housing with required supportive services, substance-use treatment, recovery, outreach, and public-safety coordination — rather than solely “housing first / low-barrier” approaches.

¹ The OHCD and/or the CoC's PRC reserve the right to request additional and/or clarifying information to inform its review of any project.

Merit Review Scoring

Process. The PRC will complete the review, scoring and evaluation process using the scoring rubrics provided in this guidance for renewals and new applications. [The scoring rubric relies on objective criteria](#) in evaluating performance. Data used in determining the degree to which objective criteria have been met by projects seeking renewal will be provided through HMIS records/OHCD.

Scores will determine each project's rank in the CoC's application to HUD and rank will be the primary determinant of placement into Tier 1 and Tier 2. Scores may also be used to reject applications or to reduce budgets and reallocate funding for low-scoring projects or over-funded projects.

Final Selection. After scoring the application, the PRC will present its resulting ranking recommendation (as discussed elsewhere in this Appendix) for funding approval to the BCCC membership meeting after which a vote will be taken on ranking. If a project is not selected for funding, the applicant has the right to appeal, provided that the appeal is based upon violations of program regulations. For example, reviewing members did not consistently follow the scoring criteria and process or if there was a conflict of interest that prevented a fair review of the proposal. No appeals will be heard based on funding level.

Tie-in to Federal Policies/Practices. All applications, (e.g. new applications, DV bonus applications and renewal applications), are scored using a rubric that evaluates practices that will improve the BCCC's system response to homelessness and align this response with national policies and best practices. These federal policies and practices include, but are not limited to:

- [A shift away from "Housing First" / supportive-housing-first paradigm toward a "treatment-first / transitional-housing / services-first" approach.](#) Permanent supportive housing becomes de-prioritized in favor of service-intensive transitional or outreach-based housing and support models.
- [Stronger emphasis on treatment, recovery, and supportive services:](#) new or renewal projects must include or require onsite substance-use treatment, supportive services (rather than optional), and integration with behavioral health / recovery infrastructure.
- [Increased focus on public-safety, law-enforcement partnerships, and compliance with local law enforcement / drug-use / encampment rules](#) — especially for SSO/street-outreach projects.
- [Stricter renewal eligibility thresholds:](#) Projects applying for renewal could be reduced or rejected if they have previously or currently engaged in certain practices — e.g., "harm reduction" like safe-injection sites; or if they use non-binary definitions of sex (which could deny funding to programs serving transgender / nonbinary individuals) or previously used "racial preferences."
- [More aggressive scoring and competition \(Merit Review\) for funding, with new weighting on project capacity, system performance, supportive services integration, compliance and data accountability](#) — making continuation of existing permanent housing projects far less certain.

Project Evaluation

The Merit Review will be used to evaluate all projects meeting threshold requirements. NOTE: All projects are measured using the same data source, same lookback period (review period for all renewals is July 1.2024 – June 30.2025) and same benchmarks to ensure equitable treatment of providers. The rubric that follows provides an outline as to possible points, categories and scoring for renewal projects and new/bonus/reallocated projects:

Scoring			
	Renewal Projects	Data Sources Relied Upon	New/Bonus/ Reallocated Projects
Criteria	Max Points		Max Points
1. Project Performance & System Outcomes			
Exits to permanent housing	10	HMIS/APRs: <i>Exits to PH, returns to homelessness, length of stay, bed/unit utilization, income/employment outcomes, data quality</i>	5
Low rate of returns to homelessness	5		5
Length of stay	5		5
A bed/unit utilization rate of ≥ 90%	5		5
Income increases / employment	5		5
HMIS Data quality & timeliness	5		N/A
Subtotal Project Performance/Outcomes	35		20
2. Project Design & Service Model			
Service participation	5	APR / Monitoring / Program Narrative: <i>Service participation rates, case management contact, documented treatment partnerships/integration</i>	5
Case management contact frequency	5		10
Demonstrated behavioral health, recovery or treatment partnerships	5		10
Subtotal Project Design & Service Model	15		25
3. Project Capacity & Fiscal Management			
Financial stability & audit history	5	APR / Monitoring: <i>Timeliness of invoices (as relevant to drawdown timeliness), expenditure alignment, staffing stability</i>	15
Staffing levels & qualifications	5		5
Prior CoC grant compliance (if applicable)	5		N/A
Subtotal Project Capacity & Fiscal Management	15		20
4. Alignment with CoC Strategy & System Impact			
Addresses unsheltered homelessness	5	APR / Local CoC Data: <i>Households served in priority populations, system gap alignment, CE prioritization/compliance</i>	10
Serves high acuity households	5		5
Fills a documented system gap / prioritization compliance	5		5
Subtotal Alignment with CoC Strategy and System Impact	15		20
5. Cost Effectiveness and Leverage			
Cost per unit / household	5	APR / Budget: <i>Cost per unit/household, match leveraged, cost efficiency</i>	5
Match and leverage demonstrating use of non-CoC funds	5		5
Subtotal Cost Effectiveness	10		10
6. Equity, Access and Person-Centered Practices			
Fair housing and equal access compliance	5	APR / Monitoring / Program Narrative: <i>Fair housing compliance, inclusion of persons with lived experience, equitable outcomes</i>	2
Demographics include people with lived experience	5		3
Subtotal Project Design & Service Model	10		5
Total Possible Merit Points	100		100

The scoring rubric weights renewal projects differently than new/bonus/reallocated projects because both categories emphasize different things:

Renewal Projects	New/Bonus/Reallocation Projects
Proven performance HMIS outcomes Grant compliance Cost efficiency	Design quality System gap response Strategic impact Organizational capacity/readiness

In so doing, the BCCC seeks to reward what works (renewals) and invest in what the system needs next (new/bonus/reallocated projects).

Ranking

HUD requires that all CoCs list all projects that they approved to submit project applications to HUD, in the order of priority as determined by the CoC. CoCs should place all new and renewal project applications that the CoC determines are high priority, high performing, and meet the needs and gaps as identified by the CoC in Tier 1. HUD will select projects in Tier 1 as described in the NOFO. HUD will select all projects in Tier 1 before selecting any projects in Tier 2. Then, HUD will select projects in Tier 2 as described in the NOFO. Lower ranked projects may be selected for funding above higher ranked projects, consistent with HUD's selection priorities.

Renewal projects must meet minimum project eligibility, capacity, timeliness, and performance standards. HUD will review information in the LOCCS; Annual Performance Reports (APRs); and information provided from the HUD local /CPD Field Office, including monitoring reports and Part 200 audit reports as applicable, as well as performance standards on prior grants, and assess a project on the following criteria using a pass/fail basis:

- ❑ Applicant's performance (*example: assisting program participants to achieve and maintain independent living and record of success*)
- ❑ Program based timeliness standards
- ❑ Timely expenditures;
- ❑ Financial management accounting practices
- ❑ Capacity
- ❑ Eligible activities

A copy of the complete BCCC's Review Ranking Procedures is available online at www.bristolcountycoc.com.

Reallocation Process

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) requires that CoCs carefully evaluate and review all renewal projects and to develop a reallocation process for projects funded with CoC funds. Reallocating funds is an important tool used by CoCs to make strategic improvements to their homelessness system. Through reallocation, the CoC can create new projects that are aligned with HUD's goals, by eliminating projects that are underperforming or are more appropriately funded from other sources. Reallocation is particularly important when new resources are not available.

The BCCC relies on this reallocation process in determining funding to ensure highest performing projects and those that can positively effect system performance throughout the continuum receive reallocated funding from lower-performing projects.

A copy of the complete BCCC's Reallocation Process is available online at www.bristolcountycoc.com.

Please be sure to review the Bristol County CoC's website for additional 2025 competition information at <https://www.bristolcountycoc.com/2025-coc-funding-competition/>.