

Elements of Scoring Section

MASS Score:

The Management Operations Indicator score provides an assessment of the PHA's management operations performance. The following are the three main calculations used to determine a MASS score:

1. Points are calculated for each of the components that have been submitted by the PHA to create a component score;
2. The component scores are calculated for each sub-indicator to create a sub-indicator score; and
3. From the six sub-indicator scores, an overall MASS score is calculated.

II. Process Workflow:

PHA submits MASS certification to REAC



NASS releases PHAS score to the PHA



MASS review and approval process is completed; MASS score is generated; MASS score is sent to PIH-REAC NASS to create a PHAS score



III. Score and Designation Status:

MASS:

- ✓ High Performer = 27 points or greater.
- ✓ Standard Performer = at least 18 points but less than 24 points.
- ✓ Substandard Management Performer = less than 18 points.

III. Score and Designation Status Continued:

B. PHAS:

A PHA will receive a designation status corresponding to its final PHAS score as follows:

| PHA Designation Status | Scoring Criteria |
|---|--|
| High Performer | A PHA that achieves a score of at least 60% of the points available under each of the four PHAS indicators and achieves an overall PHAS score of 90% or greater of the total available points under the PHAS. |
| Standard Performer | A PHA that is not a high performer shall be designated a standard performer if the PHA achieves a total PHAS score of not less than 60% of the total points available under PHAS and does not achieve less than 60% of the total points under one of the following indicators: PASS, FASS or MASS. |
| Troubled Performer | |
| 1) Overall Troubled | A PHA that achieves an overall PHAS score of less than 60% or achieves less than 60% of the total points available under <i>more than one</i> of the following indicators, MASS, PASS, or FASS, shall be designated as overall troubled. |
| 2) Troubled in One Area – Substandard Performer | A PHA that achieves less than 60% of the total points available under <i>only</i> one of the following PHAS indicators, PASS, FASS, or MASS, shall be considered a substandard physical, substandard financial, or substandard management performer. |
| 3) Capital Fund Troubled | A PHA that receives less than 60% of the maximum calculation for the Capital Fund sub-indicator under MASS. |

IV. Possible Grades:

Grades for each MASS sub-indicator/component are assigned values to indicate the percentage of the sub-indicator/component points. The system automatically grades the sub-indicator/components on a scale of A to F. Please note that some components are only graded on A, C, and F. The following matrix outlines the grades and the assessed values:

| Grades | Values |
|---------------|---------------|
| A | 1.00 |
| B | 0.85 |
| C | 0.70 |
| D | 0.50 |
| E | 0.30 |
| F | 0.00 |

V. Scoring Overview:

The component score equals the component's total possible points multiplied by the value of the letter grade for the component. For sub-indicators without components, the points are multiplied by the value of the grade for the sub-indicator. Non-assessed component points within a sub-indicator are redistributed across the components that have been assessed. Non-assessed sub-indicator points are redistributed across the sub-indicators that have been assessed.

A. Sub-Indicator and Component Points:

The distribution of points for each sub-indicator and components is shown, below.

| MASS Sub-Indicators and Components | | Points |
|---|--|---------------|
| 1 | Vacant Unit Turnaround Time | 4 |
| 2 | Capital Fund | 7 |
| 2.1 | Unexpended Funds Over 3 FFYs Old | 1 |
| 2.2 | Timeliness of Fund Obligation | 2 |
| 2.3 | Adequacy of Contract Administration | 1 |
| 2.4 | Quality of the Physical Work | 2 |
| 2.5 | Adequacy of Budget Controls | 1 |
| 3 | Work Orders | 4 |
| 3.1 | Emergency Work Orders | 2 |
| 3.2 | Non-Emergency Work Orders | 2 |
| 4 | Annual Inspection of Dwelling Units and Systems | 4 |
| 4.1 | Annual Inspection of Dwelling Units | 2 |
| 4.2 | Annual Inspection of Systems | 2 |
| 5 | Security | 4 |
| 5.1 | Tracking and Reporting Crime | 1 |
| 5.2 | Screening of Applicants | 1 |
| 5.3 | Lease Enforcement | 1 |
| 5.4 | Drug Prevention/Program Goals | 1 |
| 6 | Economic Self-Sufficiency | 7 |
| | Total MASS Points | 30 |

B. Sub-Indicator and Component Scoring:

As outlined in the example, below, a PHA with a Grade "E" for sub-indicator #4, component #1, annual inspection of dwelling units, will receive 30% of the maximum component points of 2, for a score of 0.6 for the component.

Sub-Indicator #4: Annual Inspection of Dwelling Units and Systems:

| Component | Points | Grade | Value | Calculations | Score |
|--|---------------|--------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------|
| #1 Annual Inspection of Dwelling Units | 2 | E | 0.3 | (2.0) x (0.3) | 0.6 |
| #2 Annual Inspection of Systems | 2 | A | 1.0 | (2.0) x (1.0) | 2.0 |
| <i>Total Score for sub-indicator</i> | | | | | 2.6 |

VI. Redistribution of Points:

C. Sub-Indicator Exclusions:

Under PHAS it is possible that a PHA may not be assessed for certain sub-indicators or components. For instance, a PHA might not be assessed under the economic self-sufficiency (ESS) sub-indicator (7 points) because it does not have any HUD-funded or non-HUD funded ESS programs. If a sub-indicator or component is excluded under the scoring process, the point values associated with the excluded sub-indicator or component must be redistributed to the other sub-indicators or components using a new weight. Therefore, if the ESS sub-indicator were excluded from a PHA's certification as a result of not having any ESS programs, the maximum point values for each assessed sub-indicator must be multiplied by a new weight to achieve the new redistributed point values. The weight is calculated by dividing the maximum points that are allocated to MASS, i.e., 30 points, by the remaining points once the exclusions of specific sub-indicators are taken into account. In this example, since the ESS sub-indicator is excluded, the new weight is 30/23. The weight is then multiplied with the sub-indicator score attained to get a value for the sub-indicator scores with the redistribution.

The following table outlines the redistribution of the ESS sub-indicator points.

| Sub-Indicator | | Total Possible Points | Possible Assessed Points | Redistribution Calculation | Redistributed Sub-Indicator Points |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|
| 1 | Vacant Unit Turnaround Time | 4.0 | 4.0 | (4x30)/23 | 5.22 |
| 2 | Capital Fund | 7.0 | 7.0 | (7x30)/23 | 9.13 |
| 3 | Work Orders | 4.0 | 4.0 | (4x30)/23 | 5.22 |
| 4 | Annual Inspections | 4.0 | 4.0 | (4x30)/23 | 5.22 |
| 5 | Security | 4.0 | 4.0 | (4x30)/23 | 5.22 |
| 6 | Economic Self-Suff. | 7.0 | Excluded | Excluded | Excluded |
| | Total MASS Points | 30 | 23 | | 30 |

The above example reflects the following calculations:

Step 1: Maximum points possible under MASS without exclusions are thirty (30).

Step 2: Possible total points with exclusions of the ESS sub-indicator are twenty-three (23).

Step 3: Weights = 30/23.

Step 4: Redistribution calculation = (actual sub-indicator score * weight).

Step 5: Final score = sum of redistributed sub-indicator points
 $(5.22 + 9.13 + 5.22 + 5.22 + 5.22) = 30$ points.

B. Component Exclusions:

A sub-indicator score is the sum of the component scores, with the points of non-assessed components being proportionately redistributed across components.

For example, if the calculation of Capital Fund sub-indicator has component number 1, unexpended funds over three federal fiscal years (FFYs) old, excluded, the points for this component are redistributed to other components of the sub-indicator.

The following table outlines the redistribution of the unexpended funds over three federal fiscal years (FFYs) old component that is excluded under the Capital Fund sub-indicator.

| Components | | Total Possible Component Points | Total Possible Assessed Component Points | Actual Component Score | Redistribution Calculation | Redistributed Component Points |
|---------------------------|---|--|---|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 1 | Unexpended funds over three federal fiscal years (FFYs) old | 1.0 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 2 | Timeliness of funds obligated | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.7 | $(1.7 \times 7) / 6$ | 1.98 |
| 3 | Adequacy of contract administration | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | $(1 \times 7) / 6$ | 1.16 |
| 4 | Quality of the physical work | 2.0 | 2.0 | 0.6 | $(0.6 \times 7) / 6$ | 0.70 |
| 5 | Adequacy of budget controls | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | $(0 \times 7) / 6$ | 0.0 |
| Total Sub-Indicator Score | | 7.0 | 6.0 | N/A | N/A | 3.84 |

The above example reflects the following calculations:

Step 1: Maximum component points possible under the sub-indicator without exclusions are seven (7).

Step 2: Possible total component points with exclusions of the Capital Fund sub-indicator are six (6).

Step 3: Weights = $7/6$.

Step 4: Redistribution calculation = (actual component score x weight).

Step 5: Final sub-indicator score = sum of redistributed component points
($1.98 + 1.16 + 0.70 + 0.0$) = 3.84 points.