

## CHAPTER 3. SELECTING APPLICANTS FOR FUNDING

3-1 OBJECTIVE. The objective of this chapter is to describe the process to be used for selecting the applicants to be funded from all applicants submitting applications that were reviewed and scored. Two methods are provided for: (1) a FONAP method, and (2) a National method.

## Section 1. Scoring Applications

3-2 FONAP METHOD. Upon the completion of reviewing and scoring all applications by a FONAP Panel, the complete scoring data is entered into the FONAP Assignment Sheet. The FONAP Assignment Sheet will include the difference between the two reviewers' scores. The information on that sheet is then transferred to an FONAP Rating and Ranking Summary Report which will list all scored applications by average score in rank order, highest average score to lowest. Examples of an Assignment Sheet and a Rating and Ranking Summary Report are in the Appendix.

- A. The Assignment Sheet must be reviewed by the Indian HOME Director to confirm that there are no differences in reviewers scores that are 20 or more points. If there is, the application(s) must have had a third reviewer score the application and the two closer scores used for a final rating.
- B. The Indian HOME Director for the local HUD FONAP provides notification to Headquarters, ONAP Development Division, that the scoring and data entry process is complete.

3-3 NATIONAL METHOD. Upon the completion of reviewing and scoring of all applications by a National Panel, the complete scoring data is entered into the FONAP Assignment Sheet. The FONAP Assignment Sheet will include the difference between the two reviewers scores. The information on that sheet is then transferred to an FONAP Rating and Ranking Summary Report which will list all scored applications by average score in rank order, highest average score to lowest. Examples of an Assignment Sheet and a Rating and Ranking Summary Report are in Appendix 3.

- A. The Assignment Sheet must be reviewed by the ONAP Development Director to confirm that there are no differences in reviewers' scores that are 20 or more points. If there is, the application(s) must have had a third reviewer score the application and the two closer scores used for a final rating.
- B. The ONAP Development Director provides notification to the Director, Office of Native American Programs, that the scoring and data entry process is complete.

## Section 2. Headquarters Responsibilities

### 3-4 TRANSMITTAL TO HEADQUARTERS.

- A. Upon completion of review of the rank order listing by the FONAP, the approved rank order listings shall be electronically transmitted and pouch mailed and/or faxed from FONAPs to the Headquarters ONAP Development Division. The submission shall be by transmittal memorandum from the FONAP Indian HOME Director and shall include copies of the Intake and Screening Log, Assignment Sheet, and Rating and Ranking Summary Sheet.

### Section 3. Headquarters Selection

3-5 APPROVING APPLICANTS TO BE FUNDED. Headquarters will take the following actions to approve applicants for funding:

- A. Upon receipt of all rank order listings with recommended grant award amount, the Headquarters ONAP Development Division shall review the FONAP selections. ONAP will request the FONAP to solicit sufficient environmental information from the applicants to enable the FONAP to carry out an environmental clearance. After giving grantees an opportunity to provide this information and the FONAP to review it, the applicants will be considered for selection by the FONAP and approval by ONAP. Errors, if any, will be corrected through consultation between the ONAP Development Division and the FONAP.
- B. Upon approval of the FONAP selections, the ONAP Development Division will notify each FONAP Indian HOME Director.
- C. ONAP Development Division will provide a list of selectees names to the HUD Office of General Counsel Regulations Division for publication in the Federal Register.

### Section 4. Post-Selection FONAP Actions

3-6 CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION. Upon ONAP approval of the selected applicants for funding, the FONAPs shall submit information required for Congressional notifications using the most recently issued format and instructions from the Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations (CIR) directly to CIR.

3-7 NOTIFICATION TO APPLICANTS. Following the release date for notifying applicants established by CIR, the FONAP Indian HOME Director shall ensure that the

applicants selected to receive an award are notified of their selection for the award, in writing, with copies of the grant agreement, original signed by the FONAP Administrator (the "FA") to grantee, with a copy signed by the FA to the Regional Accounting Division (the "RAD") to be used in recording funding reservations, and to the appropriate FONAP program staff. The Indian HOME Director

shall also ensure that the applicants not selected for funding are notified in writing, original to applicant, signed copy to the appropriate FONAP files.

#### Section 5. Debriefings

3-8 DEBRIEFING APPLICANTS NOT SELECTED. In the notification letter to unsuccessful applicants, they are advised that they may request information on why they were not selected for funding and ways they may improve their future opportunities for funding. Program debriefings are conducted by the local HUD FONAP staff. Debriefings should be conducted using the following guidelines:

- A. The FONAP Indian HOME Director is responsible for notifying all applicants in writing (for both successful and unsuccessful applicants).
- B. The purpose of a debriefing is to explain to an applicant the reason(s) for not being selected for funding and to provide helpful suggestions for improving their chances for being selected in future funding opportunities. The score sheets with reviewer comments are the basic source of the information to use in a debriefing. First, a few "don'ts."
  - 1. Do not tell an applicant there simply was not enough funding; they know someone was funded which means they didn't do well enough.
  - 2. Do not provide your personal opinion of the results of the evaluation or that you disagree with the results.
  - 3. Do not identify the name(s) of the reviewers. This is not helpful toward achieving the purpose of the debriefing (say this if names are requested) and may cause unnecessary bad feelings toward individuals who should not be so exposed.
  - 4. Do not quote all reviewers' comments, especially those clearly not intended for a debriefing. Stick to comments that are useful and helpful.
- C. On the "do" side:

3-3

---

7472.01

- 1. Conduct the debriefing in a scrupulously fair, objective, and impartial manner, and provide only factual information based on the results of the evaluation.
- 2. Be patient, tactful, and polite, especially in circumstances where the applicant appears to be upset with the whole process, explaining how HUD attempts to conduct open and fair competitions and that the HUD reviewers are operating under very strict procedures to be objective.

3. Inform the applicant of the factors used in the evaluation and where they were weak or deficient based on reviewer comments. It would be most helpful to point out where an applicant scored well, i.e., in the high range on any factor, as well as where they scored low.
  4. Point out areas where additional information would have possibly improved the score on a factor having a score lower than in the high range and what kind of information would have been relevant.
  5. Document the debriefing conducted in a note to file or to your supervisor, including the date, persons/organization involved, and any issues that were discussed.
- D. Information on successful applicants is available as issued in the Federal Register. This includes the names and addresses of the successful applicants and the funding amounts.
- E. For late applications, a debriefing consists of only explaining the circumstances for HUD determining the application late. The actual date/time received is the controlling factor as recorded on the receiving log sheet. There is no grace period (technically, not even one minute). These applications are returned with explanation at the same time letters are sent to applicants who were not funded and applicants who were funded. This occurs after the CIR release date.
- F. Applications that did not pass the screening reviewer's eligibility requirements list were not scored. Hence, the debriefing would be limited to explaining the deficiency(ies).
- G. Rating reviewer's eligibility requirements list. Applications failing one or more items on the rating reviewer's eligibility requirements list are not scored. Hence, the debriefing would be limited to explaining how the application failed to meet one or more of these eligibility requirements.