

# CoC Rank & Review Planning Checklist

*Works of Heart Consulting | Transparent, repeatable local competition planning*

**CURRENT STATUS NOTE:** As of August 31, 2026, HUD states the FY 2026 CoC NOFO was vacated and is no longer in force. Use this checklist as a process-design tool and apply the requirements of the next operative HUD competition notice when issued.

**Design principle:** A strong Rank & Review process should be understandable before applications are submitted, reproducible after scoring is complete, and documented well enough that an outside reviewer can follow how the CoC reached its ranking decisions.

## Before the Competition

| ✓                        | Readiness Item                                  | What Good Looks Like                                                                                                                                   | Owner / Notes |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Confirm governing authority for Rank & Review   | Governance charter, policies, and board/CoC roles align with the actual process.                                                                       |               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Define what is threshold vs scored              | Eligibility/completeness thresholds are separated from competitive scoring.                                                                            |               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Establish scoring philosophy                    | Performance, system priorities, equity, utilization, spending, data quality, participant experience, and strategic factors are intentionally weighted. |               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Define tie-breakers before applications arrive  | Tie rules are written and do not get invented around a specific project.                                                                               |               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Create conflict rules and reviewer attestations | Reviewers understand disclosure, recusal, confidentiality, and replacement procedures.                                                                 |               |

## Build the Tools

| ✓                        | Readiness Item                                | What Good Looks Like                                                                                                | Owner / Notes |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Create one scoring workbook / source of truth | Scores, evidence, reviewer notes, adjustments, and final ranking can be audited.                                    |               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Map every scored item to an evidence source   | Applicants and reviewers know whether evidence comes from HMIS, APR, application narrative, monitoring, finance, or |               |

## WORKS OF HEART CoC RESOURCE SERIES

|                          |                                 |                                                                                                                                                         |  |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
|                          |                                 | another source.                                                                                                                                         |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Test all formulas and weighting | A dry run catches reversed scales, broken formulas, double counting, and rounding problems.                                                             |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Document exception rules        | Missing data, victim-service data, new projects, first-year projects, mergers, consolidations, and unusual operating periods have predefined treatment. |  |

## Applicant Process

| ✓                        | Readiness Item                                          | What Good Looks Like                                                                  | Owner / Notes |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Publish instructions and scoring criteria               | Applicants can see the rules before submission.                                       |               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Offer a structured Q&A / TA process                     | Answers are shared consistently so one applicant does not receive a hidden advantage. |               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Use a submission checklist                              | Late/missing materials and correction windows are handled consistently.               |               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Document threshold review separately from panel scoring | Administrative completeness decisions do not quietly become reviewer discretion.      |               |

## Panel & Ranking

| ✓                        | Readiness Item                                     | What Good Looks Like                                                                          | Owner / Notes |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Train reviewers before scoring                     | Reviewers practice with the rubric and understand evidence standards.                         |               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Require written rationale for discretionary scores | Narrative judgment has a documented basis.                                                    |               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Reconcile reviewer variance                        | Large scoring differences trigger structured discussion rather than silent averaging.         |               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Record recusal and quorum decisions                | The final panel record shows who participated in each decision.                               |               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Separate mathematical rank from policy decisions   | Any CoC-authorized adjustments are documented, justified, and approved under published rules. |               |

## Appeals & Finalization

| ✓                        | Readiness Item                                      | What Good Looks Like                                                                                                     | Owner / Notes |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Appeal grounds are limited and published            | Appeals focus on process, factual error, or stated policy, not simple disagreement with ranking.                         |               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Appeals are reviewed by appropriate decision-makers | The appeal pathway avoids the same conflicted reviewer deciding the challenge.                                           |               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Final ranking and approval are documented           | Minutes/resolution show final action and any changes from preliminary scoring.                                           |               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Retain the record                                   | Applications, scoring, data extracts, reviewer forms, conflicts, appeals, approvals, and final submission are preserved. |               |

## Primary Sources

- **24 CFR 578.7 - CoC responsibilities:** <https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-24/subtitle-B/chapter-V/subchapter-C/part-578/subpart-B/section-578.7>
- **24 CFR 578.9 - Preparing an application for funds:** <https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-24/subtitle-B/chapter-V/subchapter-C/part-578/subpart-B/section-578.9>
- **HUD CoC Program Competition:** <https://www.hud.gov/hud-partners/coc-program-competition>

**Use note:** This resource is an operational aid, not legal advice or an official HUD determination. Always check the applicable competition notice, grant agreement, approved application, HUD instructions, and current regulations before relying on a checklist item.