



FY2026 RATING GUIDANCE FOR RENEWAL APPLICATIONS

Rating & Ranking Committee

Purpose. Use this guide to review the entire application and score the three narrative questions exactly as presented in the application. Applicant Profile, organizational and project information, required documentation, and attachments provide context and may verify claims, but they do not receive separate points unless the application expressly assigns points.

General Scoring Principles

- Read the entire application and all attachments before assigning narrative scores.
- The Collaborative Applicant has already calculated the 70-point objective score. Reviewers will receive that score and should not independently rescore or alter it independently.
- Use the objective score as context when reviewing the application, but assign narrative points only under the three published narrative questions.
- Consider relevant information anywhere in the application when determining whether a narrative response is complete, credible, and supported.
- Award full points only when all parts of the prompt are answered clearly, logically, specifically, and consistently with the full application.
- Reduce points for missing elements, vague statements, unsupported claims, internal inconsistencies, or responses that do not address the prompt.
- Provide comments explaining the basis for the score. Comments may be brief and may be provided for any score range.
- Do not add requirements or preferences that are not stated in the application.

Reviewer role: Review and score the 30-point narrative section. The objective score is provided for transparency and context. Questions about objective data should be flagged for the Collaborative Applicant rather than changed by an individual reviewer.

Objective Score Breakdown - Provided by the Collaborative Applicant

The objective score totals 70 points: System Performance (35), Monitoring Results (20), and Grant Management & Compliance (15). The following table shows the established calculation and scoring methodology.

Category / Metric	Max	Calculation or Standard	Points
System Performance - Returns to Homelessness	10	(Returns to homelessness / permanent housing exits) x 100	Less than 5%=10; 5-7.9%=8; 8-10.9%=6; 11-14.9%=4; Greater than or equal to 15%=2
System Performance - Length of Time Homeless	8	HUD SPM average days homeless	Less than 60 days=8; 60-74=6; 75-89=4; 90-119=2; 120+=0
System Performance - Housing Stability	10	(Permanent housing outcomes / project leavers) x 100	Great than or equal to 95%=10; 90-94.9%=8; 85-89.9%=6; 80-84.9%=4; Less than 80%=2
System Performance - Income & Benefits	7	(Participants with increase / participants served) x 100	>=60%=7; 50-59.9%=6; 40-49.9%=5; 30-39.9%=3; <30%=1
Monitoring - Previous Monitoring	10	Most recent monitoring outcome	No findings=10; minor observations=8; minor corrected findings=6; significant corrected finding=4; unresolved=2; serious=0
Monitoring - HMIS Data Quality	5	HMIS error rate and timeliness	Less than or equal to 2%=5; 2.1-5%=4; 5.1-10%=3; Greater than 10%=1; noncompliance=0
Monitoring - Corrective Actions	5	Status of required corrective actions	All complete/on time=5; minor delay=4; most complete=3; overdue=1; not completed=0

Category / Metric	Max	Calculation or Standard	Points
Grant Management - Expenditure & Drawdowns	5	Funds drawn / grant award	98-100%=5; 95-97.9%=4; 90-94.9%=3; 85-89.9%=2; <85%=1
Grant Management - Timely Reporting	5	Required HUD reports	All on time=5; one late=4; multiple late=3; repeated late=1; missing=0
Grant Management - Financial Compliance	5	Audit and monitoring evidence	Full compliance=5; minor corrected=4; several minor=3; significant=1; material noncompliance=0

Limited-data rule: When an outcome metric is unavailable because a project has insufficient operating history, the Collaborative Applicant applies the approved limited-data methodology. Reviewers should use the objective score as provided and should not substitute a narrative judgment for missing objective data.

1. Project Accomplishments & Continuous Improvement (15 points)

Application prompt: Describe the project's accomplishments during the current operating year and explain how the organization has used project performance, monitoring results, participant feedback, or other information to improve project operations or outcomes. Include significant accomplishments, challenges, corrective actions, program improvements, lessons learned, and improvements planned for the next operating year. Focus on measurable improvements rather than simply describing services provided.

Full-point elements: significant and measurable accomplishments; challenges encountered; performance, monitoring, participant feedback, or other information used; corrective actions or program improvements; lessons learned; improvements planned for the next year.

Score	Guidance	Quick example
14-15	All parts are answered clearly, logically, and specifically. Accomplishments are measurable; challenges and actions are connected; lessons and	Reports a measurable result, explains a challenge, identifies the corrective action, and shows how

Score	Guidance	Quick example
	future improvements are credible and supported by the application.	performance improved.
11-13	Most parts are fully addressed. The response is clear and credible but has one or two minor gaps, limited measurement, or less detail on lessons or future improvements.	Strong accomplishments and corrective actions are described, but participant feedback or next-year improvements are only briefly addressed.
7-10	The response addresses several elements but is general, uneven, or only partly supported. Measurable results or the connection between challenges and improvements is limited.	Lists accomplishments and challenges but provides few results and little explanation of how information led to changes.
3-6	Major parts are missing. The response mainly describes services, provides little evidence of improvement, or does not explain corrective actions and lessons learned.	Describes activities completed but does not identify measurable accomplishments or operational improvements.
1-2	Minimal relevant information is provided and most required elements are absent.	Provides one broad statement that the project was successful without supporting detail.
0	No response is provided, or the response is unrelated to the question.	Blank or nonresponsive.

Reviewer comment prompt: Identify the main strengths supporting the score and any missing, unclear, unsupported, or inconsistent elements that affected the score.

Full-score example: The applicant identifies measurable housing outcomes, explains a service-delivery challenge, describes the corrective action taken, states what was learned, and identifies a specific improvement for the next grant year.

2. System Collaboration (10 points)

Application prompt: Describe how the project contributes to the Rural Nevada Continuum of Care homeless response system. Include examples of collaboration with community partners, participation in Continuum activities, referrals and coordination with other organizations serving persons experiencing homelessness, and how the project supports coordinated service delivery and improves access to housing and community resources.

Full-point elements: contribution to the RNCOC homeless response system; specific community partnerships; participation in Continuum activities; referral and coordination practices; support for coordinated service delivery; improved access to housing and community resources.

Score	Guidance	Quick example
9-10	All parts are answered clearly and specifically. The response provides credible examples of active collaboration and explains how coordination improves service delivery and participant access.	Names partners and CoC activities, explains referral coordination, and describes the resulting improvement in access.
7-8	Most parts are addressed with useful examples. Minor gaps exist in describing CoC participation, referral processes, or the effect of collaboration.	Provides strong partner examples but only briefly explains how coordination improves access.
5-6	Some collaboration is described, but the response is general, lists partners without roles, or provides limited explanation of coordinated service delivery.	Lists several partners and referrals but does not explain how the relationships function.

Score	Guidance	Quick example
3-4	Major elements are missing. Collaboration appears limited, informal, or weakly connected to the broader system.	States that the agency collaborates with others but provides no meaningful examples.
1-2	Minimal relevant information is provided.	Mentions one partner without describing coordination or impact.
0	No response is provided, or the response is unrelated to the question.	Blank or nonresponsive.

Reviewer comment prompt: Identify the main strengths supporting the score and any missing, unclear, unsupported, or inconsistent elements that affected the score.

Full-score example: The applicant identifies specific partners and CoC activities, explains each coordination role and referral pathway, and shows how these efforts improve access to housing and services.

3. Future Planning (5 points)

Application prompt: Describe significant changes planned for the upcoming grant year that will improve project operations, participant outcomes, or organizational effectiveness. If no significant changes are planned, describe how the organization will maintain successful operations and continue monitoring performance.

Full-point elements: planned changes or a clear maintenance strategy; connection to improved operations, outcomes, or effectiveness; realistic implementation approach; continued performance monitoring.

Score	Guidance	Quick example
5	All parts are answered clearly and logically. Plans or maintenance strategies are specific, realistic, connected to identified needs, and include continued monitoring.	Identifies a specific improvement, why it is needed, how it will be implemented, and how success will be monitored.

Score	Guidance	Quick example
4	The response is strong and addresses nearly all elements, with only a minor gap in implementation or monitoring detail.	Provides a clear change and rationale but limited detail on timing or measurement.
3	The response identifies reasonable plans or maintenance activities but is general or lacks a clear link to outcomes, implementation, or monitoring.	Lists planned changes but does not explain who will implement them or how progress will be tracked.
2	Plans are vague, weakly supported, or incomplete. If no changes are planned, the maintenance and monitoring approach is underdeveloped.	States that services will continue but provides little explanation of quality assurance or monitoring.
1	Minimal relevant planning information is provided.	Provides one aspirational statement without an actionable plan.
0	No response is provided, or the response is unrelated to the question.	Blank or nonresponsive.

Reviewer comment prompt: Identify the main strengths supporting the score and any missing, unclear, unsupported, or inconsistent elements that affected the score.

Full-score example: The applicant identifies a specific staffing or program improvement, links it to a current need, provides an implementation approach, and explains how performance will be monitored.

Final Review and Score Confirmation

- ☐ The entire application and all submitted attachments were reviewed.
- ☐ The objective score was reviewed for context but was not changed or rescored.

- ☐ Each narrative score reflects all parts of the applicable prompt and relevant support elsewhere in the application.
- ☐ No criteria were added beyond the application.
- ☐ Comments explain the basis for each score and any material point deductions.
- ☐ The narrative score does not exceed 30 points.

Narrative Question	Maximum	Reviewer Score
Project Accomplishments & Continuous Improvement	15	
System Collaboration	10	
Future Planning	5	
TOTAL NARRATIVE SCORE	30	