OMB Number: 4040-0004
Expiration Date: 01/31/2009

Application for Federal Assistance SF-424

Version 02

* 1. Type of Submission:
○ Preapplication
○ Application
● Changed/Corrected Application

* 2. Type of Application:
● New
○ Continuation
○ Revision

* If Revision, select appropriate letter(s):

* Other (Specify)

* 3. Date Received: 05/02/2007

4. Applicant Identifier: 376000511

5a. Federal Entity Identifier: 00255105

* 5b. Federal Award Identifier:

State Use Only:

6. Date Received by State:

7. State Application Identifier:

8. APPLICANT INFORMATION:

* a. Legal Name: UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

* b. Employer/Taxpayer Identification Number (EIN/TIN): 37-6000511

* c. Organizational DUNS: [redacted]

d. Address:

* Street1: 1901 S. First Street, Suite A
Street2: Office of Sponsored Programs and Research Admin
* City: Champaign
County:
* State: IL: Illinois
Province:
* Country: USA: UNITED STATES
* Zip / Postal Code: 61820-7406

e. Organizational Unit:

Department Name: Urban and Regional Planning

Division Name:

f. Name and contact information of person to be contacted on matters involving this application:

Prefix: Ms.
* First Name: Kathy
Middle Name:
* Last Name: Young
Suffix:

Title: Director

Organizational Affiliation:
Office of Sponsored Programs and Research Administration

* Telephone Number: [redacted]
Fax Number: 217-239-6830

* Email: [redacted]

Application for Federal Assistance SF-424

Version 02

9. Type of Applicant 1: Select Applicant Type:

H: Public/State Controlled Institution of Higher Education

Type of Applicant 2: Select Applicant Type:

Type of Applicant 3: Select Applicant Type:

* Other (specify):

*** 10. Name of Federal Agency:**

US Department of Housing and Urban Development

11. Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number:

14.516

CFDA Title:

Doctoral Dissertation Research Grants

*** 12. Funding Opportunity Number:**

FR-5100-N-27B

* Title:

Doctoral Dissertation Research Grant Pro

13. Competition Identification Number:

DDRG

Title:

14. Areas Affected by Project (Cities, Counties, States, etc.):

*** 15. Descriptive Title of Applicant's Project:**

Modeling Spatial Spillovers from Rental to Owner Housing

Attach supporting documents as specified in agency instructions.

OMB Number: 4040-0004
Expiration Date: 01/31/2009

Application for Federal Assistance SF-424

Version 02

16. Congressional Districts Of:

* a. Applicant: IL-015

* b. Program/Project: WA-007

Attach an additional list of Program/Project Congressional Districts if needed.

17. Proposed Project:

* a. Start Date: 07/01/2007

* b. End Date: 06/30/2008

18. Estimated Funding ($):

* a. Federal	24,957.00
* b. Applicant	0.00
* c. State	0.00
* d. Local	0.00
* e. Other	0.00
* f. Program Income	0.00
* g. TOTAL	24,957.00

*** 19. Is Application Subject to Review By State Under Executive Order 12372 Process?**

○ a. This application was made available to the State under the Executive Order 12372 Process for review on ____.

○ b. Program is subject to E.O. 12372 but has not been selected by the State for review.

● c. Program is not covered by E.O. 12372.

*** 20. Is the Applicant Delinquent On Any Federal Debt? (If "Yes", provide explanation.)**

○ Yes ● No

21. *By signing this application, I certify (1) to the statements contained in the list of certifications and (2) that the statements herein are true, complete and accurate to the best of my knowledge. I also provide the required assurances** and agree to comply with any resulting terms if I accept an award. I am aware that any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statements or claims may subject me to criminal, civil, or administrative penalties. (U.S. Code, Title 218, Section 1001)**

☑ **** I AGREE**

** The list of certifications and assurances, or an internet site where you may obtain this list, is contained in the announcement or agency specific instructions.

Authorized Representative:

Prefix: Dr.

* First Name: Walter

Middle Name:

* Last Name: Knorr

Suffix:

* Title: Comptroller

* Telephone Number: [redacted]

Fax Number: 2172396830

* Email: [redacted]

* Signature of Authorized Representative: Timothy Tufte

* Date Signed: 05/02/2007

Authorized for Local Reproduction

Standard Form 424 (Revised 10/2005)
Prescribed by OMB Circular A-102

OMB Number: 4040-0004
Expiration Date: 01/31/2009

Application for Federal Assistance SF-424

Version 02

*** Applicant Federal Debt Delinquency Explanation**

The following field should contain an explanation if the Applicant organization is delinquent on any Federal Debt. Maximum number of characters that can be entered is 4,000. Try and avoid extra spaces and carriage returns to maximize the availability of space.

Attachments

AdditionalCongressionalDistricts

File Name **Mime Type**

AdditionalProjectTitle

File Name **Mime Type**

Attachments Form

Instructions: On this form, you will attach the various files that make up your grant application. Please consult with the appropriate Agency Guidelines for more information about each needed file. Please remember that any files you attach must be in the document format and named as specified in the Guidelines.

Important: Please attach your files in the proper sequence. See the appropriate Agency Guidelines for details.

1) Please attach Attachment 1	1276-2994-Client_Survey.doc	Mime Type: application/msword
2) Please attach Attachment 2	7090-DDRG-UIUC.xls	Mime Type: application/vnd.ms-excel
3) Please attach Attachment 3	4218-DDRG_UIUC.pdf	Mime Type: application/pdf
4) Please attach Attachment 4		
5) Please attach Attachment 5		
6) Please attach Attachment 6		
7) Please attach Attachment 7		
8) Please attach Attachment 8		
9) Please attach Attachment 9		
10) Please attach Attachment 10		
11) Please attach Attachment 11		
12) Please attach Attachment 12		
13) Please attach Attachment 13		
14) Please attach Attachment 14		
15) Please attach Attachment 15		

b. Table of Contents

a. SF-424.. included separately in electronic application

b. Table of Contents ....p. 1

c. Application Checklist.. not applicable

d. Executive Summary (699 words)...p. 2

e. Narrative Statement (15 pages)..p. 4

f. University Support Letter ....on file

g. HUD-424-CB Detailed Budget...................... included separately in electronic application

Budget Narrative...p. 19

h. Appendix .... not applicable

d. Executive Summary

Modeling Spatial Spillovers from Rental to Owner Housing

Motivation The successful implementation of HUD's goal to expand access to and availability of decent, affordable rental housing (B1) for low-incomes residents (priority A) and special needs populations (priority F1) hinges on avoiding negative externalities for the host neighborhood receiving these new subsidized rental units. In strong housing submarkets, the anticipated development of these units often generates vehement opposition out of fear of declining property values. In weak submarkets, housing investments are often legitimated with arguments that the housing units will have positive neighborhood revitalization effects. To avoid negative impacts and facilitate positive ones, it is important to better understand and quantity the policy-relevant conditions under which subsidized rental units have negative, positive, or neutral impacts on single-family homes.

Research Questions This dissertation expands on the traditional research question *Do subsidized rental units have a measurable impact on nearby property values?* by addressing this question in the context of multiple subsidized housing programs (such as Housing Choice Vouchers, Low Income Housing Tax Credits, and scattered-site public housing) and by analyzing how concentrations of units (by size and location) influence impacts. The dissertation is the first to address the question how spillover effects of new subsidized rentals compare to those of new unsubsidized rentals. It also asks for the first time in how far rental spillover effects differ by local land-use and zoning context (e.g., single- versus multi-family areas).

Methodology An adjusted interrupted time series (AITS) model that grew out of HUD-funded research in the late 1990s emerged as the gold standard for addressing the traditional research question (Galster et al. 2003). However, important research gaps remain. The AITS and its underlying traditional time-series-based approach insufficiently model the spatial effects (spatial autocorrelation and spatial heterogeneity) inherent in spatial spillovers. A key purpose of this dissertation is to improve the spatial intelligence of the AITS model and to offer alternative, explicitly spatial, models to assess clustered spillover effects, including threshold and tipping-point effects in different land use and zoning contexts.

This is done in several ways: 1) By assessing model assumptions through exploratory spatial data analysis techniques, including geographically weighted regression (with aerial images); 2) By modeling the spatial segmentation of housing markets through the incorporation of geographic and manmade drivers of this segmentation, such as elevation, locational amenities, and zoning. 3) By testing for the presence of spatial autocorrelation (i.e. spatial spillovers between nearby sales prices); and 4) By comparing the performance of the AITS model to state-of-the-art spatial regression models (spatial lag or error models), estimated using Maximum Likelihood and spatial 2SLS (Anselin 1988); and finally, 5) By applying a spatial point pattern model (Diggle 2003) to not only capture neighborhood effects of individual rental sites (AITS) but also to measure cluster and threshold effects of multiple nearby sites.

Data The analysis is based on a comprehensive dataset of all tenant and project-based subsidized units in Seattle from the City of Seattle, Seattle Housing Authority, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Data from the King County Department of Assessment identify housing characteristics and property sales over a 10-year period (1986-96). High-resolution aerial images are linked to additional geographic layers from the City of Seattle, including property parcels, water areas, parks, elevation, census tract boundaries, and zoning.

Preliminary Findings Preliminary findings were presented at four research conferences in 2006 and early 2007. The findings prove provocative since they suggest that impacts detected in the commonly used OLS-based AITS model are often no longer significant in spatial models that adequately control for spatial autocorrelation. The current dissertation work has been recognized by two national awards, the Urban Affairs Association's *Emerging Scholar Award* and the Lincoln Land Institute's *Dissertation Fellowship.*

Eligibility Criteria [redacted] has been enrolled at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign's (UIUC) Department of Urban and Regional Planning since January 2004. UIUC is accredited by the North Central Associate of Colleges and Schools (most recently in 2000). [redacted] is a lawful permanent resident (Form [redacted]). [redacted] dissertation proposal was approved in May 2006 and all other written and oral doctoral degree requirements, including all examinations, were satisfactorily completed. [redacted] serves as [redacted] dissertation advisor.

(699 out of 700 words)

Student's Contact Information:
[redacted]
Ph.D. Candidate
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Department of Urban and Regional Planning
[redacted]
Champaign, IL 61820
Email: [redacted]
Department phone: [redacted]
fax: [redacted]

Faculty Advisor/Principal Investigator's Contact Information:
[redacted]
Faculty Excellence Professor
Director, Spatial Analysis Laboratory
Senior Research Scientist, National Center for Supercomputing Applications

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Department of Geography
[redacted]
Urbana, IL 61801-3637
Email: [redacted]
Department phone: [redacted]
fax: [redacted]

e. Narrative Statement

Dissertation Title: Modeling Spatial Spillovers from Rental to Owner Housing

Rating Factor 1: Capacity to do the Research

a. Skills and Expertise My research capacity was recently recognized at a national level through the Urban Affairs Association's *Emerging Scholar Award* (April 2007) and the Lincoln Land Institute's *Dissertation Fellowship Award* (May 2006). The dissertation requires research skills in quasi-experimental design, quantitative modeling, and spatial data analysis. I completed graduate level courses in spatial analysis, advanced spatial data analysis and spatial econometrics in the past two years at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIUC).

In addition, I successfully competed to participate in a quasi-experimental design and analysis training at Northwestern University in spring 2007. I worked as a research assistant to [redacted], an internationally recognized expert in spatial analysis and as TA for several of his summer short courses, most recently in 2006 in Groningen (Netherlands) and his courses taught, e.g., for the University of Michigan's ICPSR Summer Program in Quantitative Analysis (2004-2005). In addition, I provide technical support to the over 1,000 subscribers of a listserv on spatial data analysis software at the Spatial Analysis Lab at UIUC.

b. Knowledge and Experience Beyond the methodological training described above, the substantive focus of the dissertation is on assessing impacts of subsidized rental housing programs. My recent relevant knowledge in this area is based on both coursework and field experience. Before joining graduate school in 2004, I was a member of the national evaluation team to assess the performance of the community development investments of the *Living Cities* initiative, which is funded by HUD and major national foundations. During my studies of the past three years, I also continued to work as a consultant with a Seattle-based research firm, conducting data and mapping analysis in the context of community development.

I continued to update my knowledge on housing policy through graduate level courses at UIUC's Planning Department and presented preliminary results of my dissertation at three research conferences in 2006 (*American Association of Geographers* (AAG), *Urban Affairs Association* (UAA) and *American Real Estate and Urban Economics Association* (AREUEA)). This year's results will also be presented at several conferences (*Urban Affairs Association* (UAA) and *Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning* (ACSP) abstracts both accepted; *Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management* (APPAM) and *American Evaluation Association* (AEA) abstracts submitted).

c. Preliminary Steps Taken to Identify Dissertation Topic & Questions

A key purpose of this dissertation is to improve the best current models that are widely used to assess spillovers from rental to owner housing by applying state-of-the-art spatial methods. An extensive literature review, approved by the dissertation committee as part of the dissertation proposal, revealed that no current research exists in this regard. The choice of the topic and hypotheses were informed and approved by two of the main experts in subsidized housing spillover modeling [redacted] and spatial econometrics [redacted] who both supervise the dissertation.

Research Questions The starting point for this dissertation is a question researchers addressed with substantial national funding (including from HUD) in the recent past: *Do subsidized rental units have a measurable impact on nearby property values – and at what number and what extent of clustering?* Answering this question is not only relevant to identify potential impacts of a particular housing program (such as Housing Choice Vouchers). It is also extended to compare impacts of different housing programs, e.g. *What are the differential impacts of scattered-site public housing vs. housing choice vouchers (vs. project-based nonprofit housing, etc.) on nearby property values?*

This dissertation is the first to extend the traditional research focus on the impact of subsidized rental housing to a focus on unsubsidized rental housing: *How do spillovers of subsidized rental units compare to those of unsubsidized rentals?* The omission of unsubsidized rental units in the literature is important since many homeowners fail to accurately distinguish subsidized from unsubsidized rentals (Galster et al. 1999). Finally, the dissertation addresses the question: *Do these subsidized housing spillover effects vary by land use and zoning context, e.g., do they differ depending on the existing mix and spatial patterning of rental and owner units?*

Hypotheses The null hypothesis is that rental housing (of different subsidy types as well as unsubsidized housing) has no impact on the sales prices of nearby single-family homes. A variation of this null hypothesis is that there is no difference between the impacts of subsidized rentals and unsubsidized rentals.

Rival hypotheses to be tested are that rental units have negative impacts on nearby sales prices and that these impacts increase the more rental units are clustered. Based on prior research (Galster et al. 1999), these impacts are expected to be non-linear, i.e. impacts only start to be registered beyond a certain threshold. Rental units in worse housing condition are expected to generate negative spillover effects to a greater extent than those in average or good condition. Finally, targeted neighborhood investments should have positive externalities in the impact area.

Rating Factor 2: Need for the Research

a. Need for Funding The substantive need to fund this dissertation is rooted in the need for improved tools to measure housing and community development impacts. Without this dissertation, current widely used spillover models generate potentially flawed findings, which are disseminated nationally and linked to housing policy recommendations without awareness of either potential flaws or improved alternatives. In terms of financial need, the dissertation has been supported by the Lincoln Land Institute's Dissertation Fellowship until June 2007. The last year of dissertation work (July 2007 to June 2008) is not supported by any other funding or research/teaching assistantships.

b. Impact on Research Community This dissertation has the potential to reveal flaws in existing subsidized rental spillover findings (which affects related policy recommendations) and offer improved alternative models based on new spatial methods. This is done by applying methods that are well-established in spatial econometrics but have not yet been applied to existing spillover models.

The dissertation improves the *Adjusted Interrupted Time Series* (AITS) model ([redacted] et al. 2004) which is widely used and accepted to measure place-based spillover effects of assisted housing programs and neighborhood revitalization initiatives [redacted] et al. 2007; [redacted] et al. 2007). The model is based on a hedonic regression with spatial fixed effects. Initial evidence supports (i.e. failed to reject) the hypothesis that it insufficiently controls for spatial autocorrelation. This suggests that currently published and accepted findings on impacts of subsidized housing (and related policy recommendations) might need to be reassessed.

Researchers and evaluators are in need of tools to measure the impacts of place-based programs. Evidence that demonstrates why commonly used existing tools are inadequate and how they can be improved is greatly valued by this community, as illustrated by the positive feedback and broad interest in the dissertation topic at research conferences in 2006 and accepted conference abstracts in 2007.

c. Relation to HUD's Goals This dissertation's findings inform HUD's goal of expanding access to and availability of decent affordable housing (B1). It identifies the conditions under which different types of affordable housing have negative, neutral or positive impacts, with a particular focus on land use and zoning contexts. This information is useful to minimize negative impacts of new subsidized housing in host neighborhoods and avoid problems related to further concentrations of poverty.

Rating Factor 3: Soundness of the Approach

a. Quality of Research: Research Design and Methodology

The research questions are addressed in a new spatial methodological framework in three parts: Part I is exploratory; Part II involves a replication of the most frequently used adjusted interrupted time series (AITS) model and a comparison of its results to those of spatial regression models, while Part III moves beyond the limitations of these benchmark models and offers an improved alternative based on spatial point pattern modeling.

The dissertation is the first to bring together comprehensive data sources on all subsidized housing programs in Seattle, aerial images, property data, and land use/zoning data and other sources. The integration of these data sources makes it possible to address research questions and hypotheses that have not yet been addressed by prior research, generally based on isolated data (e.g., only one subsidized housing program or only sales data but no zoning data). Such questions include how spillover effects of subsidized rental housing differ from those of unsubsidized housing and how impacts vary by zoning context.

Literature Three sets of literature inform this dissertation: 1) previous studies on subsidized housing impacts (e.g., [redacted] et al. 1993; [redacted] 1974; [redacted] et al. 1999; [redacted] et al. 1985; [redacted] t al. 1999; [redacted] 1993; [redacted] 1963; [redacted] et al. 2001; [redacted] et al.

1983); 2) research on impact measurement and quasi-experimental research design (e.g., [redacted] 2006; [redacted] 1999 [redacted] 1993; [redacted] 2002); and 3) literature on spatial econometrics and spatial data analysis (e.g., [redacted] 1988; [redacted] 1995; [redacted] 1990; [redacted] 2003). The first two strands of research have been brought together before.

Some recent interrupted time series models begin to incorporate spatial econometric methods in regards to rental spillovers ([redacted] et al. 2005; [redacted] et al. 2005; [redacted] et al. 2003; [redacted] et al. 2004; [redacted] et al. 2001). However, no studies to date comprehensively account for spatial feedback effects (spatial dependence) and spatial variation of effects (spatial heterogeneity). This dissertation addresses this research gap: It advances the modeling of spillover effects of subsidized housing on nearby property values in Seattle, WA by taking the spatial context of land use and zoning into account and by applying state-of-the-art spatial exploratory and confirmatory methods.

Methods Part I In Part I, exploratory spatial analysis tools (*GeoDa, STARS, GWR*) are used in conjunction with aerial images (ortho photos) that cover over 100,000 properties. The purpose is a) to clean and format the data in a process that includes checking the location of deleted or outlying observations; b) to interactively explore the spatial patterning of rental and owner units; c) to examine model assumptions (e.g., in regards to the case-control design); and d) to assess natural and manmade boundaries such as streets and ravines that act as impact barriers but are not incorporated in existing research. The high-resolution projection "wall" at the University's National Center for Supercomputing Applications is used for this analysis. None of these tools have been used before in this context.

Methods Part II Part II establishes the benchmark of current state-of-the art modeling by replicating the AITS model for Seattle. The AITS model is specified as a traditional hedonic model ([redacted]1974) with the following additions: Dummy variables for time of sale, spatial fixed effects (tract dummies), spatial correction variables (trend surface), and a series of impact variables. The impact variables measure both the sales price levels and trends of those sales in the vicinity of assisted housing (defined by three distance bands) before and after the development of such housing in an impact and control area. It is estimated using Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) with robust standard errors.

After establishing this benchmark, the main contribution of Part II consists in increasing the "spatial intelligence" of the AITS model in several ways: 1) By modeling the spatial segmentation of housing markets through the incorporation of geographic and manmade drivers of this segmentation, such as elevation (improved views), proximity to locational amenities (such as water or parks), and land use/zoning. 2) By testing for the presence of spatial autocorrelation (i.e. spatial spillovers between nearby sales prices), which, if present, results in biased and/or inefficient coefficients; and 3) By conducting a sensitivity analysis that compares the AITS benchmark results with those derived from the specification of current spatial econometric models (spatial lag or error models), estimated using Maximum Likelihood and spatial 2SLS ([redacted]988).

Methods Part III Part III extends this analysis further by addressing some of the key research gaps that the AITS model leaves unresolved, including cluster effects, interactions with existing rental units and possible tipping points where not only nearby property values are affected but neighborhoods start to change in terms of their rental-owner housing mix. This will be done with a model that draws on advances in spatial point pattern modeling ([redacted]2003).

The idea is to start by modeling the probability that housing units of different types are developed in certain zoning areas to control for site selection bias. Then, over a ten-year period and at different spatial scales, the model tests for thresholds at which the introduction of one more rental unit with different characteristics (e.g., assisted housing program, unsubsidized, condition, property characteristics etc.) results in significant neighborhood effects.

Data The study is implemented for Seattle, WA since the City of Seattle contains several of the best publicly accessible housing and geographic data in the country. High-resolution aerial images that identify every housing parcel, roads, water areas, parks and other features are the point of departure. These ortho photos were geo-referenced (i.e. linked) with additional geographic layers from the City of Seattle, including property parcels, water areas, parks, elevation, census tract boundaries, and zoning. Data from the King County Department of Assessment were joined with the property parcels to identify housing characteristics (including housing condition), rental vs. owner properties, and sales dates over a 10-year period (1986-96, before HOPE VI developments in 1997 changed the subsidized housing landscape in the city).

To identify nearby subsidized units, data from the City, Seattle Housing Authority, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) were geo-coded. These data include all tenant-based, project-based, and owner subsidized units in Seattle, e.g., housing choice vouchers, Low Income Housing Tax Credits, public housing (large-scale and scattered-site), FHA, subsidized homeownership (*Homesight*), and other project-based housing subsidies.

Preliminary Results Preliminary results (presented at three conferences in 2006) indicate that even the best currently used interrupted time series models do not adequately account for spatially correlated sales prices (at least in Seattle). When explicitly spatial models are used instead, rental impacts that these traditional models found to be significant were no longer significant – a provocative finding if confirmed by the final results.

b. Specific Activities

An extensive literature review was completed as part of the dissertation proposal (defended in May 2006). The collection of all data sources mentioned in the previous section is concluded. Preliminary analysis using the data is complete as well. The methodology was approved by the dissertation committee, received favorable feedback at research conferences in 2006, and national recognition through the aforementioned emerging scholar award and dissertation fellowship. Hence, the feasibility of the dissertation in terms of data collection, viability of methods, and model implementation is guaranteed. DDRG funding is needed to implement the three methods parts described above.

The milestone chart below outlines the remaining tasks, duration of tasks, and timeline by quarter required to complete the dissertation. I anticipate completing the first part of the methodology (exploratory analysis) by August 2007. The projection wall at the National Center for Supercomputing Applications (NCSA) required for this analysis was already tested in spring 2007 and I have approval to use it for the dissertation. I obtained the necessary software (*GeoDa* and *Geographically Weighted Regression* (*GWR*) and *STARS*).

Methods Part II is scheduled to be completed between August and September of 2007. The results of this part will be presented in paper and presentation format at the *Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning* (ACSP) conference in October 2007. I have the necessary software for this part (*Stata, R*, and *GeoDa*) and tested it in the preliminary analysis. The Spatial Analysis Lab has the software required to capture the wall content as a movie for later presentation of results to non-technical audiences.

Milestone Chart

Year		2007		2008	
Quarter	*Prior to July 1 (DDRG Start Date)*	*July to Sept*	*Oct to Dec*	*Jan to March*	*April to June*
Dissertation Proposal Defense	Completed				
Data Collection	Completed				
Methods Part I		July/August			
Methods Part II		September	October: Presentation/ paper of Part II results (ACSP)		
Methods Part III			November: Presentation/paper of Part III results (APPAM)		
Dissertation Completion			Nov/Dec: Conference follow-up revisions	Jan-March: Write-up of results	Early April: Defense April: Final Revisions Late April: —Presentation of diss. results at UAA —Deposit
Dissemination					May/June: —Web availability —Submission: 3 articles

Methods Part III will be implemented in October 2007. The results will be disseminated and discussed in paper and presentation format at the *Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management* (APPAM) conference in early November. Revisions based on conference feedback will be incorporated in November and December 2007. The final results are written up between January and March 2008. The tentative dissertation defense date is early April 2008. Committee feedback will be incorporated throughout April, with an anticipated deposit date of late April. Final dissertation results will be presented at the *Urban Affairs Association* (UAA) 2008 conference in late April.

In May 2008, the dissertation and short movie of visual results will be made publicly available. May and June will be used to turn the dissertation (and the ACSP/APPAM papers) into articles. I plan to submit three articles to peer-reviewed journals by the end of June 2008 (for details on these outputs, see rating factor 4 below).

Key individuals assisting in the completion of the dissertation are the members of the dissertation committee, chaired by Professor [redacted] (spatial econometrics) and consisting of Professor [redacted] (urban economics), Associate Professor [redacted] (urban economics) and Assistant Professor [redacted] (housing policy).

c. HUD Policy Priorities One of the key problems in offering more affordable rental housing to low-income persons and persons with special needs (including chronically homeless persons) are NIMBY (*Not in My Backyard*) responses of the host neighborhood to such housing. Preventing an actual decline in property values or a further concentration of poverty as a result of new affordable housing is an important component of implementing the priority to increase homeownership and rental opportunities for underserved populations (Priorities A & F1).

Using new spatial techniques, this dissertation improves current methods to determine context-specific threshold and cluster effects of subsidized housing, including supportive housing and group homes. For instance, findings will indicate how impacts differ by subsidized unit size in single-family versus multi-family areas and which spatial distribution of units at what concentration avoids impacts. Although the dissertation focuses on one city, Seattle, WA, as a proof-of-concept, the improved methodology will be designed to be replicable in other cities. This information serves as an additional tool for planners and housing policy stake holders to successfully mediate NIMBY concerns and avoid negative property value impacts due to new subsidized housing units.

d. Dissemination Strategies The principal strategy to disseminate the dissertation's findings will be three peer-reviewed publications and 3-4 presentations at research conferences in both 2007 and 2008. Details on both strategies are described below in the output section of rating factor 4. Past presentations at research conferences and single- as well as co-authored publications of peer-reviewed articles serve as evidence that I am capable of disseminating the dissertation's research results as anticipated.

Additional dissemination strategies include the websites of funders, e.g., HUD (if funded), the Lincoln Land Institute, and UIUC's Spatial Analysis Laboratory. Since the dissertation involves an exploratory analysis and an analysis of model results with aerial images on a projection wall (see Methods Part I above), these results will be captured in the form of a short movie, which makes it easy for non-technical audiences to intuitively grasp the meaning of the findings. The movie could be accessed on the above websites.

Rating Factor 4: Achieving Results and Program Evaluation

a. Outcomes Performance will be tracked based on the following six outcomes: 1) Completion and approval of the dissertation; 2) Public availability of dissertation (e.g., through Dissertation Abstracts or other media); 3) Presentation of dissertation findings at research conferences (see below); 4) Submission of findings at three peer-reviewed journals (details see below); 5) Dissertation findings address HUD's goal B1; 5) Findings address HUD's priorities A and F1. To efficiently manage the implementation of the dissertation, I developed a password-protected dissertation project management website, hosted on a Spatial Analysis Lab server. The site is accessed daily and already contains more than 100 pages.

b. Interim Benchmarks (Outputs) Dissertation results are expected to be presented at three to four research conferences in 2007. Presentations are already accepted at the *Urban Affairs Association* (UAA) conference (*Measuring Housing Impacts with Spatial Hedonic Models*) and the *Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning* (ACSP) conference (*What About Spillover Effects of Un-Assisted Rental Housing?*). Abstract acceptance is pending for the *Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management* (APPAM) conference (*Improving the Spatial Intelligence of Neighborhood Effects Models*) and the American Evaluation Association (AEA) conference (*Evaluating Impacts of Place-Based Initiatives: An Application of a Spatially Improved Interrupted Time Series Design*).

To facilitate a more focused discussion of spillover effects at two of these conferences, I coordinated relevant panels at ACSP (*Modeling Neighborhood Change and Spillovers in Hot Markets*) and APPAM (*Neighborhood Impacts of Concentrated Poverty and Assisted Housing*), including, e.g. [redacted] research and [redacted] research team at New York University. Presentations of the final results are planned at the same conferences in 2008, which will be the conference outputs for next year.

The following outputs are planned to achieve the outcome of submitting findings to peer-reviewed journals:

1) An article that demonstrates why spatial intelligence should be added to the current rental spillover models and how this can be done, e.g., submitted to *Evaluation Review*, or *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* (revised APPAM paper).

2) A summary of the substantive findings of the dissertation of interest to housing policy analysts and planners, e.g. submitted to *Housing Policy Debate* or the *Journal of the American Planning Association* (revised ACSP paper).

3) An analysis of spatial effects in existing rental spillover models, e.g., submitted to *Journal of Planning Literature and Education* (based on the completed literature review of the dissertation proposal).

2. Sequence of Tasks All required data collection is completed. Data are currently stored in databases and statistical program formats (e.g., Stata). The completion and approval of the dissertation, which addresses the relevant HUD goal and two priorities, is tentatively scheduled for late April 2008. Findings will be presented at the research conferences mentioned above in April (UAA), October (ACSP), and November (APPAM, AEA) of 2007 and 2008. Conference papers will be prepared as articles to be submitted in peer-reviewed journals such as the ones mentioned above after the defense of the dissertation in May/June 2008. The milestone chart in the above section outlines the timeline of these tasks in more detail. All major potential obstacles have been resolved in the dissertation pre-testing stage.

References

Accordino, John, George Galster, and Peter Tatian. (2005). *The Impacts of Targeted Public and Nonprofit Investment on Neighborhood Development.* Richmond, VA: Community Affairs Office of the Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond, July.

Anselin, Luc. (1988). *Spatial Econometrics: Methods and Models.* Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Bailey, T.C. and Gatrell, A. C. (1995). *Interactive Spatial Data Analysis.* John Wiley and Sons, New York, NY.

Bloom, Howard S. and James A. Riccio. (2005). "Using Place-Based Random Assignment and Comparative Interrupted Time-Series Analysis to Evaluate the Jobs-Plus Employment Program for Public Housing Residents." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science,* 599(1), 19-51.

Can, Ayse. (1990). *Modeling Spatial Variation in House Price Determinants.* Ph.D. Dissertation (Ohio State University, Columbus, OH).

Cummings, Paul and John Landis. (1993). "Relationships Between Affordable Housing Developments and Neighboring Property Values." Institute of Urban and Regional Development, University of California at Berkeley, Working Paper 599.

deSalvo, Joseph S. (1974). "Neighborhood Upgrading Effects of Middle-Income Housing Projects in New York City." *Journal of Urban Economics,* 1: 269-277.

Diggle, Peter J (2003). *Statistical Analysis of Spatial Point Patterns (2nd edition)*. Edward Arnold.

Ellen, Ingrid Gould, Amy Ellen Schwartz, Ioan Voicu, and Michael H. Schill. (2007). "Does Federally Subsidized Rental Housing Depress Neighborhood Property Values?" *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 26(2), 257-280.

Ellen, Ingrid Gould and Ian Voicu. (2005). *Nonprofit Housing and Neighborhood Spillovers.* Law and Economics Research Series. Working Paper 05-03.

Galster, George, Peter Tatian, and John Accordino. (2007). *Targeting Investments for Neighborhood Revitalization.* Journal of the American Planning Association. 72(4), 457-474.

Galster, George C., Peter A. Tatian, Anna M. Santiago, Kathryn L. S. Pettit, and Robin E. Smith. (2003). *Why Not in My Backyard?* Rutgers, NJ: The State University of New Jersey.

Galster, George, Peter Tatian, and Robin Smith. 1999. "The Impact of Neighbors Who Use Section 8 Certificates on Property Values." *Housing Policy Debate* 10 (4): 879–917.

Galster, George, Kenneth Tempkin, Chris Walker, and Noah Sawyer. (2004). "Measuring Impacts of Community Development Initiatives. A New Application of the Adjusted Interrupted Time-Series Method." *Evaluation Review*, December, 28(6): 502-538.

Guy, D.C., J.L. Hysom, and S. R. Ruth. (1985). The Effect of of Subsidized Housing on Values of Adjacent Housing. *Journal of the American Real Estate & Urban Economics Association*, 13:378-87.

Lanbein, Laura and Claire L. Felbinger. (2006). *Public Program Evaluation. A Statistical Guide.* Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

Lee, Chang-Moo, Dennis P. Culhane, Susan M. Wachter. (1999). "The Differential Impacts of Federally Assisted Housing Programs on Nearby Property Values: A Philadelphia Case Study." *Housing Policy Debate* 10*(1):* 75-93.

Lyons, Robert and Scott Loveridge. (1993). *An Hedonic Estimation of the Effect of Federally Subsidized Housing on Nearby Residential Property Values.* University of Minnesota, Department of Applied Economics.

Nourse, Hugh O. 1963. "The Effect of Public Housing on Property Values in St. Louis." *Land Economics* 39 (4): 443–441.

Orr, Larry L. (1999). *Social Experiments. Evaluating Public Programs with Experimental Methods.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Rosen, Sherwin M. (1974). "Hedonic Prices and Implicit Markets: Product Differentiation in Pure Competition." *Journal of Political Economy*, 82:534–557.

Rossi, Peter H. and Howard E. Freeman. (1993). *Evaluation. A Systematic Approach.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Santiago, Anna M., George C. Galster, and Peter Tatian. (2001). "Assessing the Property Value Impacts of the Dispersed Housing Subsidy Program in Denver." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 20 (1): 65–88.

Shadish, William R., Thomas D. Cook, and Donald T. Campbell. (2002). *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Generalized Causal Inference.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Warren, Elizabeth, Robert M. Aduddell, and Raymond Tatalovich. (1983). *The Impact of Subsidized Housing on Property Values: A Two-Pronged Analysis of Chicago and Cook County Suburbs.* Urban Insight Series No. 13. Chicago: Center for Urban Policy, Loyola University of Chicago.

g. Budget Narrative

Salary

[redacted] is budgeted at a 50% Ph.D. student annual (12-month) salary of $20,394.

[redacted] will serve as Faculty Advisor on this project and will not bill for any time.

Fringe Benefits

The graduate assistant fringe benefit rate is 5.13% (health insurance), plus 0.013% workers compensation, totaling $1,073.

Total salary and fringe benefits are $21,467.

Conference Travel

Travel funds will be used to present the research at three conferences, the *Urban Affairs* Annual conference in Baltimore, MD, the *ACSP-AESOP* Annual conference in Chicago, IL (or the *American Evaluation Association* conference in Denver, CO) and the APPAM conference in Los Angeles, CA. Each conference requires air fare and hotel stays for 4 nights, estimated to total $736 and $1,350, respectively, and 12 days at UIUC's per diem rate totaling $384. For a total of $2,470 for the course of the project.

Supplies

Supplies include photocopying and printing expenses estimated at $220, software upgrades (Stata 9 and software upgrades to capture the visualization results) costing $515, and other office supplies up to $285. For a total of $1,020 over the course of the project.

Total Expenses (travel and supplies) are $3,490.

Total Direct Costs (salary & fringe benefits; conference travel & supplies): $24,957

Grant Applications
Detailed Budget

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

OMB Approval No. 2501-0017
(expires 03/31/2005)

* Organization Name: UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

* Project/Activity Name: DDRG-UIUC

Functional Categories Year 1: ● Year 2: ○ Year 3: ○ All Years: ○

	Column 1 HUD Share ($)	Column 2 Applicant Match ($)	Column 3 Other HUD Funds ($)	Column 4 Other Fed Share ($)	Column 5 State Share ($)	Column 6 Local/Tribal Share ($)	Column 7 Other Share ($)	Column 8 Program Income ($)	Column 9 Total ($)
a. Personnel (Direct Labor)	20,394.00								20,394.00
b. Fringe Benefits	1,073.00								1,073.00
c. Travel	2,470.00								2,470.00
d. Equipment (only items > $5,000 depreciated value)									0.00
e. Supplies (only items < $5,000 depreciated value)	1,020.00								1,020.00
f. Contractual									0.00
g. Construction									
1. Administration and Legal Expenses									0.00
2. Land, Structures, Rights-of-Way, Appraisals, etc.									0.00
3. Relocation Expenses and Payments									0.00
. Architectural and Engineering Fees									0.00
. Other Architectural and Engineering Fees									0.00
. Project Inspection Fees									0.00
. Site Work									0.00
. Demolition and Removal									0.00
. Construction									0.00
0. Equipment									0.00
1. Contingencies									0.00
2. Miscellaneous									0.00
Other Direct Costs									0.00
Subtotal of Direct Costs									0.00
ndirect Costs (% Approved direct Cost Rate: ☐%)									0.00
rand Total (Year 1):									24,957.00
rand Total (All Years):									24,957.00

king Number: GRANT00256375

form **HUD-424-CB** (1/2004)

Grant Applications
Detailed Budget

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

OMB Approval No. 2501-0017
(expires 03/31/2005)

* Organization Name: UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

* Project/Activity Name: DDRG-UIUC

Functional Categories — Year 1: ○ Year 2: ● Year 3: ○ All Years: ○

	Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7	Column 8	Column 9
	HUD Share ($)	Applicant Match ($)	Other HUD Funds ($)	Other Fed Share ($)	State Share ($)	Local/Tribal Share ($)	Other Share ($)	Program Income ($)	Total ($)
a. Personnel (Direct Labor)									
b. Fringe Benefits									
c. Travel									
d. Equipment (only items > $5,000 depreciated value)									
e. Supplies (only items < $5,000 depreciated value)									
f. Contractual									
g. Construction									
1. Administration and Legal Expenses									
2. Land, Structures, Rights-of-Way, Appraisals, etc.									
3. Relocation Expenses and Payments									
4. Architectural and Engineering Fees									
. Other Architectural and Engineering Fees									
. Project Inspection Fees									
. Site Work									
. Demolition and Removal									
. Construction									
0. Equipment									
1. Contingencies									
2. Miscellaneous									
Other Direct Costs									
Subtotal of Direct Costs									
Indirect Costs (% Approved direct Cost Rate: ☐ %)									
rand Total (Year 2):									
rand Total (All Years):									
king Number: GRANT00256375									24,957.00

form **HUD-424-CB** (1/2004)

Grant Applications
Detailed Budget

**U.S. Department of Housing
and Urban Development**

OMB Approval No. 2501-0017
(expires 03/31/2005)

* Organization Name: UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

* Project/Activity Name: DDRG-UIUC

Functional Categories   Year 1: ○ Year 2: ○ Year 3: ● All Years: ○

	Column 1 HUD Share ($)	Column 2 Applicant Match ($)	Column 3 Other HUD Funds ($)	Column 4 Other Fed Share ($)	Column 5 State Share ($)	Column 6 Local/Tribal Share ($)	Column 7 Other Share ($)	Column 8 Program Income ($)	Column 9 Total ($)
a. Personnel (Direct Labor)									
b. Fringe Benefits									
c. Travel									
d. Equipment (only items > $5,000 depreciated value)									
e. Supplies (only items < $5,000 depreciated value)									
f. Contractual									
g. Construction									
1. Administration and Legal Expenses									
2. Land, Structures, Rights-of-Way, Appraisals, etc.									
3. Relocation Expenses and Payments									
. Architectural and Engineering Fees									
. Other Architectural and Engineering Fees									
. Project Inspection Fees									
. Site Work									
. Demolition and Removal									
. Construction									
0. Equipment									
1. Contingencies									
2. Miscellaneous									
Other Direct Costs									
Subtotal of Direct Costs									
ndirect Costs (% Approved direct Cost Rate: ☐ %)									
and Total (Year 3):									
and Total (All Years):									
king Number: GRANT00256375									24,957.00

form **HUD-424-CB** (1/2004)

Grant Applications
Detailed Budget

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

OMB Approval No. 2501-0017
(expires 03/31/2005)

* Organization Name: UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

* Project/Activity Name: DDRG-UIUC

Functional Categories Year 1: ○ Year 2: ○ Year 3: ○ All Years: ●

	Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7	Column 8	Column 9
	HUD Share ($)	Applicant Match ($)	Other HUD Funds ($)	Other Fed Share ($)	State Share ($)	Local/Tribal Share ($)	Other Share ($)	Program Income ($)	Total ($)
a. Personnel (Direct Labor)	20,394.00								20,394.00
b. Fringe Benefits	1,073.00								1,073.00
c. Travel	2,470.00								2,470.00
d. Equipment (only items > $5,000 depreciated value)	0.00								0.00
e. Supplies (only items < $5,000 depreciated value)	1,020.00								1,020.00
f. Contractual									0.00
g. Construction									
1. Administration and Legal Expenses									0.00
2. Land, Structures, Rights-of-Way, Appraisals, etc.									0.00
3. Relocation Expenses and Payments									0.00
4. Architectural and Engineering Fees									0.00
5. Other Architectural and Engineering Fees									0.00
6. Project Inspection Fees									0.00
7. Site Work									0.00
8. Demolition and Removal									0.00
9. Construction									0.00
10. Equipment									0.00
11. Contingencies									0.00
12. Miscellaneous									0.00
Other Direct Costs									0.00
Subtotal of Direct Costs									0.00
Indirect Costs (% Approved Indirect Cost Rate: ☐ %)									0.00
Grand Total (Year All):									24,957.00
Grand Total (All Years):									24,957.00

Tracking Number: GRANT00256375

form **HUD-424-CB** (1/2004)

DISCLOSURE OF LOBBYING ACTIVITIES

Complete this form to disclose lobbying activities pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1352
(See reverse for public burden disclosure.)

Approved by OMB
0348-0046

1. * Type of Federal Action: _a. contract ●b. grant _c. cooperative agreement _d. loan _e. loan guarantee _f. loan insurance	2. * Status of Federal Action: _a. bid/offer/application ●b. initial award _c. post-award	3. * Report Type: ●a. initial filing _b. material change For Material Change Only: year quarter date of last report

4. Name and Address of Reporting Entity: ●Prime _SubAwardee Tier if known: * Name: University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign * Address: 1901 S. First St. Champaign IL: Illinois 61820 Congressional District, if known: 15th	5. If Reporting Entity in No.4 is Subawardee, Enter Name and Address of Prime:
6. * Federal Department/Agency: Dept. of Housing and Urban Development	7. * Federal Program Name/Description: Doctoral Dissertation Research Grants CFDA Number, if applicable: 14.516
8. Federal Action Number, if known:	9. Award Amount, if known: $24,957.00
10. a. Name and Address of Lobbying Registrant (if individual, complete name): * Name: none none * Address: 1901 S. First St. Suite A Champaign IL: Illinois 61820	b. Individual Performing Services (including address if different from No. 10a): * Name: none none * Address: 1901 S. First St. Suite A Champaign IL: Illinois 61820
11. Information requested through this form is authorized by title 31 U.S.C. section 1352. This disclosure of lobbying activities is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed by the tier above when the transaction was made or entered into. This disclosure is required pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1352.	* Signature: Timothy Tufte * Name: Dr.

Tracking Number: GRANT00256375

This information will be reported to the Congress semi-annually and will be available for public inspection. Any person who fails to file the required disclosure shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than $10,000 and not more than $100,000 for each such failure.	Walter Knorr Title: Comptroller Telephone No.: [redacted] Date: 05-02-2007
Federal Use Only:	Authorized for Local Reproduction Standard Form - LLL (Rev. 7-97)

Public Burden Disclosure Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act, as amended, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB Control Number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is OMB No. 0348-0046. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 10 minutes per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0348-0046), Washington, DC 20503.

Applicant/Recipient Disclosure/Update Report

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

OMB Approval No. 2510-0011
(exp. 12/31/2006)

Applicant/Recipient Information *** Duns Number:** [redacted] *** Report Type:** INITIAL

1. Applicant/Recipient Name, Address, and Phone (include area code):

* Applicant Name:
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

* Street1: 1901 S. First Street, Suite A
Street2: Office of Sponsored Programs and Research Admin
* City: Champaign
County:
* State: IL: Illinois
* Zip Code: 61820-7406 * Country: USA: UNITED STATES
* Phone: [redacted]

2. Social Security Number or Employer ID Number: 37-6000511

* 3. HUD Program Name:
Doctoral Dissertation Research Grants

* 4. Amount of HUD Assistance Requested/Received: $ 24,957.00

5. State the name and location (street address, City and State) of the project or activity:

* Project Name: Modeling Spatial Spillovers from Rental to Owner Housing
* Street1: 611 Taft
Street2: 111 Temple Buell Hall
* City: Champaign
County: Champaign
* State: IL: Illinois
* Zip Code: 61820 * Country: USA: UNITED STATES

Part I Threshold Determinations

* 1. Are you applying for assistance for a specific project or activity? These terms do not include formula grants, such as public housing operating subsidy or CDBG block grants. (For further information see 24 CFR Sec. 4.3).

● **Yes** ○ **No**

* 2. Have you received or do you expect to receive assistance within the jurisdiction of the Department (HUD), involving the project or activity in this application, in excess of $200,000 during this fiscal year (Oct. 1 - Sep. 30)? For further information, see 24 CFR Sec. 4.9

○ **Yes** ● **No**

If you answered "**No**" to either question 1 or 2, **Stop!** You do not need to complete the remainder of this form.

However, you must sign the certification at the end of the report.

OMB Approval No. 2510-0011
(exp. 12/31/2006)

Part II Other Government Assistance Provided or Requested / Expected Sources and Use of Funds.

Such assistance includes, but is not limited to, any grant, loan, subsidy, guarantee, insurance, payment, credit, or tax benefit.

Department/State/Local Agency Name:

* Government Agency Name:

Government Agency Address:

* Street1:

Street2:

* City:

County:

* State:

* Zip Code: * Country:

* Type of Assistance: * Amount Requested/Provided: $

* Expected Uses of the Funds:

Department/State/Local Agency Name:

* Government Agency Name:

Government Agency Address:

* Street1:

Street2:

* City:

County:

* State:

* Zip Code: * Country:

* Type of Assistance: * Amount Requested/Provided: $

* Expected Uses of the Funds:

(**Note:** Use Additional pages if necessary.)

OMB Approval No. 2510-0011
(exp. 12/31/2006)

Part III Interested Parties. You must disclose:

1. All developers, contractors, or consultants involved in the application for the assistance or in the planning, development, or implementation of the project or activity and
2. any other person who has a financial interest in the project or activity for which the assistance is sought that exceeds $50,000 or 10 percent of the assistance (whichever is lower).

Alphabetical list of all persons with a reportable financial interest in the project or activity (For individuals, give the last name first)	* Social Security No. or Employee ID No.	* Type of Participation in Project/Activity	* Financial Interest in Project/Activity ($ and %)
			$ %
			$ %
			$ %
			$ %
			$ %

(**Note:** Use Additional pages if necessary.)

Certification

Warning: If you knowingly make a false statement on this form, you may be subject to civil or criminal penalties under Section 1001 of Title 18 of the United States Code. In addition, any person who knowingly and materially violates any required disclosures of information, including intentional non-disclosure, is subject to civil money penalty not to exceed $10,000 for each violation. I certify that this information is true and complete.

* Signature:
Timothy Tufte

* Date: (mm/dd/yyyy)
05/02/2007

Attachments

AdditionalInfo_attDataGroup0

File Name **Mime Type**

AdditionalInfo1_attDataGroup0

File Name **Mime Type**

Survey on Ensuring Equal Opportunity for Applicants

OMB NO. 1890-0014 EXP. 2/28/2009

Purpose: The Federal government is committed to ensuring that all qualified applicants, small or large, non-religious or faith-based, have an equal opportunity to compete for Federal funding. In order for us to better understand the population of applicants for Federal funds, we are asking nonprofit private organizations (not including private universities) to fill out this survey.

Upon receipt, the survey will be separated from the application. Information provided on the survey will not be considered in any way in making funding decisions and will not be included in the Federal grants database. While your help in this data collection process is greatly appreciated, completion of this survey is voluntary.

Instructions for Submitting the Survey: If you are applying using a hard copy application, please place the completed survey in an envelope labeled "Applicant Survey." Seal the envelope and include it along with your application package. If you are applying electronically, please submit this survey along with your application.

Applicant's (Organization) Name:
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS URBANA-CHAMPAIGN
Applicant's DUNS Name:
[redacted]
Federal Program:
Doctoral Dissertation Research Grant Pro
CFDA Number:
14.516

1. Has the applicant ever received a grant or contract from the Federal government?
● Yes _No

2. Is the applicant a faith-based organization?
_ Yes ● No

3. Is the applicant a secular organization?
● Yes _No

4. Does the applicant have 501(c)(3) status?
● Yes _No

5. Is the applicant a local affiliate of a national organization?
_Yes ● No

6. How many full-time equivalent employees does the applicant have? (Check only one box).
_ 3 or Fewer
_4 -5
_6 -14
_15 - 50
_51 - 100
● Over 1000

7. What is the size of the applicant's annual budget? (Check only one box.)
[redacted]
Less Than $150,000
$150,000 - $299,999
$300,000 - $499,999
$500,000 - $999,999
$1,000,000 - $4,999,999
$5,000,000 or more

Survey on Ensuring Equal Opportunity for Applicants

OMB NO. 1890-0014 EXP. 2/28/2009

Provide the applicant's (organization) name and number and the grant name and CFDA number.

1. Self-explanatory.

2. Self-identify.

3. Self-identify.

4. 501(c)(3) status is a legal designation provided on application to the Internal Revenue Service by eligible organizations. Some grant programs may require nonprofit applicants to have 501(c)(3) status. Other grant programs do not.

5. Self-explanatory.

6. For example, two part-time employees who each work half-time equal one full-time equivalent employee. If the applicant is a local affiliate of a national organization, the responses to survey questions 2 and 3 should reflect the staff and budget size of the local affiliate.

7. Annual budget means the amount of money your organization spends each year on all of its activities.

Paperwork Burden Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is **1890-0014.** The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average five (5) minutes per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection.

If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate(s) or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: The Agency Contact listed in this grant application package.

Facsimile Transmittal

1175542324 - 5653

U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Office of Department Grants Management and Oversight

OMB Approval No. 2525-0118
exp. Date (04/30/2005)

*** Name of of Document Transmitting:** DDRG-UIUC

1. Applicant Information:

* Legal Name: UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

* Address:

* Street1: 1901 S. First Street, Suite A

Street2: Office of Sponsored Programs and Research Admin

* City: Champaign

County:

* State: IL: Illinois

* Zip Code: 61820-7406 * Country: USA: UNITED STATES

2. Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number:

* Organizational DUN[redacted] CFDA No.: 14.516

Title: Doctoral Dissertation Research Grants

Program Component:

3. Facsimile Contact Information:

Department: Urban and Regional Planning

Division:

4. Name and telephone number of person to be contacted on matters involving this facsimile.

Prefix: Ms. * First Name: Kathy

Middle Name:

* Last Name: Young

Suffix:

* Phone Number: [redacted]

Fax Number: 2172396830

*** 5. Email:** [redacted]

*** 6. What is your Transmittal? (Check one box per fax)**

● a. Certification ○ b. Document ○ c. Match/Leverage Letter ○ d. Other

*** 7. How many pages (including cover) are being faxed?** 1

Form **HUD-96011** (10/12/2004)

Tracking Number: GRANT00256375

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT YOU PRINT THESE INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE CONTINUING

It may be helpful to print out a copy of the instructions and have them on hand while creating your eLOGIC MODEL™. These instructions may not look exactly as displayed on your screen. To print any of the 12 Worksheets, select the TAB with your cursor at the bottom of screen and use your print function (usually File | Print).

Do not modify the workbook. Do not change the integrity of the form by adding additional tabs or worksheets. The instructions provided here will meet your needs.

SECURITY AND THE USE OF "MACROS"

The 2007 HUD eLogic Model™ when downloaded and opened may prompt a "Macro" alert on your screen. "Macros" are a form of programming used in Excel to enable additional functionality. You will need to "enable" the "Macros" to use all functions on your eLOGIC MODEL™. After submission of your eLogic Model™ grant application, you may reset your security levels to their original settings. Depending on your version of Excel™, there are several steps you must take in order to use the eLogic Model™. A description is provided below for three most common versions of Excel™ in use today, one of which is probably installed on your computer.

NOTE: If you do not enable the "Macros" your eLogic Model™ will not function properly. If you are working in a network, and you cannot control your desktop settings, contact your system administrator for support. Some of you may already be very familiar with Macros. If you are not, here are some easy step-by-step instructions for you to follow to enable the Macros.

Excel™ 2003 - There are four levels of security regarding the use of "Macros": Very High, High, Medium, and Low. If upon opening the eLogic Model™ the dialog box states that you must change your Security setting to enable "Macros", your security settings are either set to Very High or High and you must take the following steps: Go to the toolbar at the top of the screen and click on "Tools". Then click "Options" and then click the tab labeled "Security" located on the top right of the window. At the bottom right of the window, click the button that says "Macro Security" and select Medium as your setting. Click "OK" and then click "OK" in the Options window. Close your eLogic Model™. Re-open your eLogic Model™. You will now receive a dialog box with the message "Security Warning". Click on the button at the bottom that says "Enable Macros". Your eLogic Model™ will open and be fully functional.

If upon opening the eLogic Model™ the dialog box gives you an option to enable "Macros" at that moment, it means that Security is set to Medium. All you need to do is to click the button at the bottom of the dialog box that says "Enable Macros". Your eLogic Model™ will open and be fully functional.

If upon opening the eLogic Model™ there is no dialog box, your Security setting is set on "Low" and your Macros are already enabled. There is no additional step needed.

Excel™ 2000 -There are three levels of security regarding the use of "Macros": High, Medium, and Low. The High security setting automatically disables most Macros and does not alert you to the action. If, when entering Services/Activities in Column 3, or Outcomes in Column 5, you select "other," the word "other" appears and remains in the cell, the Macro is not functioning. Save and close changes you have made thus far. Then from the menu, select "Tools," "Macro," "Security". A dialog box will open. Click on the "Security" TAB and select "Medium," then click "OK." Reopen your eLogic Model™. A dialog box will open. Select "Enable Macros". Your eLogic Model™ will open and be fully functional.

If your copy of Excel is already set to "Medium" security, the enable Macros dialog box will appear and you can proceed as above.

The low security setting automatically enables all Macros and you will not receive any message. The eLogic Model™ will open and be fully functional.

Excel™ 1997 - If you are using this version of Excel, please contact HUD's NOFA Information Center for assistance at (800) HUD-8929. Persons with hearing or speech impairments may access this number via TTY by calling the Federal Information Relay Service at (800) 877-8339. The NOFA Information Center is open between the hours of 10 a.m. and 6:30 p.m. eastern time, Monday through Friday, except federal holidays.

eLOGIC MODEL™ SPECIAL FEATURES
There are several new features available in this year's eLOGIC MODEL™:

Populate Worksheets - When identifying information is entered in the Year1 worksheet, e.g. Applicant Name, Project Name, and Component Name, this information will automatically populate or carryover into the Year2, Year 3, and Total worksheets. Activities and Outcomes do not populate as there are any number of combinations of activites that can be performed over the life of an award.

Expand Worksheet Columns for Better Viewing - The Need (Column 2), Service or Activity (Column 3) and Outcome (Column 3) columns can be expanded for better viewing. See additional details under, COLUMNS OF THE eLOGIC MODEL™ (1-7).

Use of "Other" In the Dropdown List for "Services or Activities/Output" and "Outcome"
The dropdown lists for "Services or Activities/Output" and "Outcome" can be expanded to include up to three additional entries. If a service/activity and outcome in the existing dropdown lists do not adequately reflect your project, your may select "other" and add up to three additional entries for "Services or Activities/Output" and three additional entries for "Outcome". These entries are for the total duration of the project, not each year. For example, if you want to add one "other" activity and associated outcome in Year1, Year2 and Year3 you will not be able to add any additional "other " items. Please bear this in mind when determining the need to select "other" rather than an item already identified in the drop down menu. See additional details under, COLUMNS OF THE eLOGIC MODEL™ (1-7).

A Reporting TAB Has Been Added
The worksheets of the eLogic Model™ contain projections of services or activities and outcomes in support of your proposed project. If you are selected for funding, your approved eLogic Model™ will lock the approved activities/output and proposed projections of your eLogic Model™ and also open up the post reporting functionality. You will be provided a copy of your approved eLogic Model™with your award agreement. The approved eLogic Model™ will allow you to report actual numbers in the space provided in the "post" column.

A"Reporting" TAB has been designed to contain two text boxes. Use the text boxes provided. The first provides an area for reporting any positive/negative deviations from the approved eLogic Model™ projections and the basis for the deviations. The second text box is to be used to report responses to the Management Questions negotiated by the HUD program offices as part of your award. See additional details under, INSTRUCTIONS FOR REPORTING PERFORMANCE TO HUD.

This ends the highlights section. The following are detailed instructions for completing the eLogic Model™.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING THE eLOGIC MODEL™

BACKGROUND

The eLogic Model™ form (4 copies, Year1 Year2 Year3 and Total) is contained within this Excel™ Workbook. The Workbook has 12 separate worksheets and each worksheet is identified by a TAB at the bottom of the page. **If you cannot see all the TABS, be sure to maximize the workbook by clicking the middle button in the top right corner of the workbook to expand your window or move your bottom scroll bar so all the TABS appear. Usually this situation does not occur. If it does, the Reporting TAB and the Evaluation TAB may be hidden until you follow the above procedure.** The worksheet(s) labeled "Year1 Year2 Year3 and Total" contain the actual form that you should complete. The other Worksheet(s) provide supportive and reporting information. The TABs are:

Instructions
Year1
Year2
Year3
Total
GoalsPriorities
Needs
Services
Outcomes
Tools
Reporting
Evaluation

12 - Worksheets

ACCESSING THE eLOGIC MODEL™

Select the TAB labeled "Year1." This is the first copy of the eLogic Model™ form. The additional copies of the form labeled Year2 Year3 and Total are used for multiple year grants to specify Activities and Outcomes for each year of the proposed program. Year2, for example, would contain Activities and Outcomes projected for the second year ONLY (not a cumulative total from Year1). Applicants applying for a multiple year grant must complete a worksheet for each year of performance, plus a total worksheet showing a cumulative total for all years covered by the award. The "Total" worksheet must reflect the sum of all years of the grant. For example, a two-year grant would include Year1 and Year2 and Total. A three-year grant would include Year1 Year2 Year3 and Total. A one-year grant would include ONLY Year1. A Total worksheet is not required for one year grants.

NOTE: Each cell of the worksheet is "lock protected" so you can only make entries in cells that are for input as directed by these instructions.

To complete the eLogic Model™ form, in the first row there is a label, "Applicant Name", cell [E1]. Enter the name of the applicant organization applying for funding. Enter the Applicant Name exactly as it appears in box 15 of the SF-424. Once you have entered your "Applicant Name" in the worksheet labeled Year1, the Year2, Year3, and Total worksheets will automatically populate the same information.

In the second row there is a label, "Project Name:" Enter the name of your project in cell [E2]. Use exactly the same name as you did on box 8a.of the form SF-424. If you are submitting multiple applications under the same applicant name for the same HUD program, you must include a project name that can distinguish between the two applications and logic models submitted, e.g. HBCU-Dillard-Affordable Housing15, HBCU-Dillard-Affordable Housing16. If the project name is not known at time of application then insert TBD1, TBD2, etc, e.g. HBCU-Dillard-TBD1, HBCU-Dillard-TBD2. Once you have entered your "Project Name" in the worksheet labeled Year1, the Year2, Year3, and Total worksheets will automatically populate the same information.

Immediately below "Project Name," there is a field for "Term," which corresponds to worksheets for Year1, or Year2, or Year3, or Total. This field is already pre-filled. Immediately below TERM is a field designated for the HUD Program Name. This field is already pre-filled; please verify that it matches the program for which you are applying. You will also see a field labeled "Component Name:", cell [L-4]. If the program under which you are applying has components, e.g., EOI or PEI under the Fair Housing Initiatives Program, or a TA Program under the CDTA NOFA, enter the name of the program component for which you are applying. If there are no components in the funding opportunity for which you are seeking funding, leave this field blank. Once you have entered your "Component Name" in the worksheet labeled Year1, Year2, Year3, and Total will automatically populate the same information.

To the right of the Applicant and Project fields, there are fields labeled Period and Start Date and End Date. Leave these fields blank. They are for reporting purposes. See additional details under, INSTRUCTIONS FOR REPORTING PERFORMANCE TO HUD.

COLUMNS OF THE eLOGIC MODEL™ (1-7)

Column 1 – Policy
Under the "Policy" Column (1), there are actually two columns; one for HUD Goals, and one for Policy Priority. Review the HUD Goals and Policy Priorities by clicking on the TAB labeled "GoalsPriorities" at the bottom of the workbook. For each of the eLogic Model™ worksheets used in your application (Year1 Year2 Year3 Total) select the HUD Goals and Policy Priorities that your program will address. You do this by clicking the mouse in one of the cells in column (1) of the worksheets labeled (Year1 Year2 Year3 Total). A little dropdown arrow appears. Click the dropdown arrow and a dropdown list of letters and numbers that correspond to the HUD Goals and Policy Priority will appear. Select one of the HUD Goals and Policy Priority letter/number in the list by clicking it. Repeat this process in other cells of the HUD Goals column and the Policy Priority column until you have selected all that apply to your application.

Column 2 – Planning
Under the "Planning" Column (2), select a Problem,Need,Situation statement. Do this by clicking the mouse in one of the cells of this column. A little dropdown arrow appears. Click the dropdown arrow and a dropdown list of Need Statements appears. Select one or more of the Need Statements in the list by clicking it. Because the column is too narrow to show the full Need Statement in the dropdown list, you may wish to refer to the TAB labeled "Needs" to see the full Need Statement or you can (using your mouse) click on the shaded cell [D5] labeled **Problem, Need, Situation** and this will expand the cell. To return the cell to its original size, click again on cell [D5] labeled **Problem, Need, Situation.**

NOTE: When expanding and returning the cell to its original size, click once. Do not double click.

When you select a Need Statement, the full Need Statement will fill the cell. If you don't want this Need Statement, you can simply click the dropdown arrow again and select another item. Or, you can delete a Need Statement by selecting the cell and clicking the DELETE KEY on your keyboard. If you want to select more than one Need Statement, go to the next cell in the column and repeat the process, selecting the appropriate Need Statement. You can do this until you have selected all the Needs Statements that are appropriate to your proposed program. The selections should reflect the needs identified in your response to your Rating factor narratives. There is no need to select all the Need Statements if they do not apply to what you plan to address or accomplish with the funding requested.

Column 3 – Programming
Under the "Programming" Column (3), select a Service or Activity. You do this by clicking the mouse in one of the cells of this column. A little dropdown arrow appears. Click the dropdown arrow and a dropdown list of eligible Services or Activities appears. Select one of the Services or Activities in the list by clicking it. List Year1 Services or Activities using the Year1 worksheet of the form. List Year2 Services or Activities using the Year2 worksheet of the form. List Year3 Activities using the Year3 worksheet of the form. Make a composite Logic Model of all years on the Total worksheet. If you are only applying for one year grant, you do not need to create a composite Logic Model on the Total TAB. Because the column is too narrow to show the full Services or Activities/Outputs Statement in the dropdown list, you may wish to refer to the TAB labeled "Services" to see the full range of eligible Services or Activities/Outputs or you can (using your mouse) click on the shaded cell [E5] **Service or Activities/Outputs.** This will expand the cell. To return the cell to its original size, click on shaded cell [E5] **Service or Activities/Outputs.**

NOTE: When expanding and returning the cell to its original size, click once. Do not double click.

NOTE: If the Service or Activity/Outputs that you are looking for does not appear on the dropdown list, choose "Other" from the dropdown list. A dialog box will appear that says "Year1". Click "OK" and another dialog box will appear that says "You have selected "Other" which means that "you must create a new Activity or Outcome and a Unit of Measure, are you prepared to do this Now?", click "Yes" if you wish to continue. You will see an input window that says "Enter a new Activity or Outcome to your selection list". Enter your Service or Activity in the field provided and click "OK". A second window will appear that says "Specify a Unit of Measure for the Activity or Outcome you entered". Enter the unit of measure in the field provided and click "OK". The new Service or Activity will appear in the Logic Model cell and it will be added to the dropdown list. **YOU ARE ONLY PERMITTED TO ADD A TOTAL OF THREE NEW SERVICES OR ACTIVITIES PER LOGIC MODEL.**

In the event that you want to delete, or change your newly created Service or Activity, click the TAB labeled Services at the bottom of your screen and then click cell [B1] **"Click here to allow deletion of New Activities" at the top right of the window.** A dialog box will appear that says "Click on a new Activity to delete it from you Logic Model", click "OK". A dialog box will appear that says "Caution! This will delete all instances of new services or activities in your Logic Model, do you wish to continue?" Click "Yes". The new Activity you added will be displayed with the prefix "new". You can only delete new Services or Activities.

Column 4 – Measure
Notice that as the Service or Activity you selected appears in the cell, a corresponding unit of measure appears or populates in the Measure column. The unit of measure could be "persons", "dollars", "square feet", "houses", or some other unit of measure that relates to the selected Service or Activity. Immediately below the unit of measure are two blank cells. Enter the projected number of units you are proposing to deliver or accomplish in the "Pre" column. The "Post" column is locked to be used later for reporting purposes.

Column 5 – Impact
Under the "Impact" Column (5), select the Outcome that best corresponds to the Need and Service or Activity that you just previously identified and selected for your logic model. Do this the same way as previously described for Needs and Services or Activities. Select an Outcome from the dropdown list. Notice that once again, a unit of measure automatically appears in the next column "Measure". Because the column is too narrow to show the full Outcome Statement in the dropdown list, you may wish to refer to the TAB labeled "Outcomes" to see the full range of Outcomes or you can (using your mouse) click on the shaded cell [I5] **Outcome.** This will expand the cell. To return the cell to its original size, click on shaded cell [I5] **Outcome.**

NOTE: When expanding and returning the cell to its original size, click once. Do not double click.

NOTE: If the Outcome that you are looking for does not appear on the dropdown list, choose "Other" from the dropdown list. A dialog box will appear that says "Year1". Click "OK" and another dialog box will appear that says "You have selected "Other" which means that "you must create a new Activity or Outcome and a Unit of Measure, are you prepared to do this Now?", click "Yes" if you wish to continue. You will see an input window that says "Enter a new Activity or Outcome to your selection list". Enter your Outcome in the field provided and click "OK". A second window will appear that says "Specify a Unit of Measure for the Activity or Outcome you entered". Enter the unit of measure in the field provided and click "OK". The new Outcome will appear in the Logic Model cell and it will be added to the dropdown list. **YOU ARE ONLY PERMITTED TO ADD A TOTAL OF THREE NEW OUTCOMES PER LOGIC MODEL.**

In the event that you want to delete, or change your newly created Outcome, click the TAB labeled Outcomes at the bottom of your screen and then click cell [B1] "Click here to allow deletion of New Outcomes" at the top right of the window. A dialog box will appear that says "Click on a new Outcome to delete it from your Logic Model", click "OK". A dialog box will appear that says "Caution! This will delete all instances of new outcomes in your Logic Model, do you wish to continue?" Click "Yes". The new Outcome you added will be displayed with the prefix "new". You can only delete new Outcomes.

Column 6 – Measure
Under the "Measure" Column 6, specify a projected number of Outcome units you are proposing.

Repeat the process of specifying a Need, a Service or Activity, and an Outcome using as many rows as is necessary to fully describe your proposal. The eLogic Model™ form extends to about three pages when printed out. You may view a preprint of your model at any time by selecting from the Menu bar at the very top of the Excel Window: FILES | Print Preview. It is recommended that you do this periodically to get a better view of the logic model you are creating.

NOTE: You can adjust the look of your logic model by skipping rows, so that Needs, Activities, and Outcomes are grouped appropriately.

CAUTION, DO NOT CUT & PASTE ITEMS FROM ONE COLUMN TO ANOTHER. For example, do not cut and paste an item from the Needs column to the Service or Activity column, or the Activity column to the Outcome column. You will produce an unstable worksheet which will behave erratically, requiring you to start over with a new blank eLogic Model™ workbook.

Column 7 – Accountability
Under the "Accountability" column (7), enter the tools and the process of collection and processing of data in your organization to support all project management, reporting, and responding to the Management Questions. This column provides the framework for structuring your data collection efforts. If the collection and processing of data is not well planned, the likelihood of its use to further the management of the program and support evaluation activity is limited. If data are collected inconsistently, or if data are missing, or if data are not retrievable, or if data are mishandled, the validity of any conclusions is weakened.

The structure of Column 7 contains five components in the form of dropdown fields that address the Evaluation Process. You are responsible for addressing each of the five steps that address the process of managing the critical information about your project.

A. Tools for Measurement
B. Where Data Maintained
C. Source of Data
D. Frequency Collection
E. Processing of Data

You may select up to five choices for each of the five processes (A-E) that supports Accountability and tracks Outputs and Outcomes. Given the limited space, please identify the most frequent sources for the processes (A-E). As you proceed through the remaining components, B through E, specify those components in the same order as you selected the "Tools For Measurement" listed under item A. That is, if the first Tool is "Pre-post Test," then the first item under B "Where Data Maintained" must identify where the pre-post test data is maintained, and so on through E the first entry should pertain to "Pre-post Test." Likewise, if the second item in A is "Satisfaction Surveys," then specify the second item in B through E as it pertains to "Satisfaction Surveys."

A. Tools for Measurement. A device is needed for collecting data; e.g., a test, a survey, an attendance log, an inspection report, etc. The tool "holds" the evidence of the realized Output or Outcome specified in the logic model. At times, there could be multiple tools for a given event. A choice can be made to use several tools, or rely on one that is most reliable, or most efficient but still reliable. Whatever the tool, it is important to remain consistent throughout the project.
Instructions: Under the Accountability column, select your choices of Tools to Track Outputs and Outcomes. You do this by clicking the mouse in one of the cells of this column. A little dropdown arrow appears. Click the dropdown arrow and a dropdown list of Tools appears. Select one or more of the Tools in the list by clicking it.

B. Where Data Maintained. A record of where the data or data tool resides must be maintained. It is not required that all tools and all data are kept in one single place. You may keep attendance logs at the main office files, but keep other tools or data such as a "case record" in the case files at the service site. It is important to designate where tools and/or data are to be maintained. For example, if your program has a sophisticated computer system and all data is entered into a custom-designed database, it is necessary to designate where the original or source documents will be maintained.
Instructions: Under the Accountability column, select your choices of Where Data Maintained. You do this by clicking the mouse in one of the cells of this column. A little dropdown arrow appears. Click the dropdown arrow and a dropdown list of Where Data Maintained appears. Select one or more of the Where Data Maintained in the list by clicking it.

C. Source of Data. This is the source where the data originates. Identify the source and make sure that it is appropriate.
Instructions: Under the Accountability column, select your choices of Source of Data. You do this by clicking the mouse in one of the cells of this column. A little dropdown arrow appears. Click the dropdown arrow and a dropdown list of Source of Data appears. Select one or more of the Source of Data in the list by clicking it.

D. Frequency of Collection. Timing matters in data collection. In most instances, you want to get it while it occurs. Collect data at the time of the encounter; if impossible, when it is most opportune immediately thereafter. For example, collect report card data immediately upon the issuance of report cards. Do not wait until after the school year is over. Collect feedback surveys at the conclusion of the event, not a few months later when clients may be difficult to reach. Reporting can be done at anytime if the data is already collected. Another important aspect of this dimension is consistency. If some post tests are collected soon after the event, but others are attempted months later, the data are confounded by the differences in the timing. If some financial data are collected at the middle of the month and others at the end of the month, the data may be confounded by systematic timing bias.
Instructions: Under the Accountability column select your choices of Frequency of Collection. You do this by clicking the mouse in one of the cells of this column. A little dropdown arrow appears. Click the dropdown arrow and a dropdown list of Frequency of Collection appears. Select one or more of the Frequency of Collection in the list by clicking it.

E. Processing of Data. This is where you identify the mechanism that will be employed to process the data. Some possibilities are: manual tallies, computer spreadsheets, flat file database, relational database, statistical database, etc. The eLogic Model™ is only a summary of the program and it cannot accommodate a full description of your management information system. There is an implicit assumption that the grantee has thought through the process to assure that the mechanism is adequate to the task(s).
Instructions: Under the Accountability column, select your choices of Processing Data. You do this by clicking the mouse in one of the cells of this column. A little dropdown arrow appears. Click the dropdown arrow and a dropdown list of Processing of Data appears. Select one or more of the Process of Data in the list by clicking it.

SAVING YOUR eLOGIC MODEL™
When you are finished completing the eLogic Model™ form, or wish to stop and continue later, save the file by going to Excel's™ Menu bar and choosing FILE | Save As. Then specify a name for the file, and note where you save the file on your hard drive. Use the name of the HUD Program and your organization name to form a file name for your eLogic Model™, e.g., HBCU-Dillard.xls or HCP-UrbanLeague.xls. Excel™ automatically adds the file extension ".xls" to your file name. Make sure the file extension .xls is not capitalized. In following these directions, if your organizational name exceeds the 50 character limit for space, you should abbreviate your organizational name by either using its initials or a recognizable acronym, e.g. South Carolina State University maybe written as SCSU; Howard University maybe written as HOWDU.

If you are submitting multiple applications under the same applicant name for the same HUD program, you must include a project name that can distinguish between the two applications and logic models submitted, e.g. HBCU-Dillard-Affordable Housing15.xls, HBCU-Dillard-Affordable Housing16.xls. Please be sure to review the file formats and naming requirements contained in the General Section.

Later, you will "Attach" this file to your application. Please remember the name of the file that you are saving. Be sure to delete any earlier version so that when you go to attach the file to your application you select the appropriate and final file.

A single workbook will be adequate for completing your eLogic Model™.

This ends the instructions for completing your Logic Model for application submission.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR REPORTING PERFORMANCE TO HUD

Do not change the integrity of the form by adding additional tabs or worksheets. The instructions and the worksheets provided in your eLogic Model™ will meet your needs.

If your project is selected for funding, the eLogic Model™ will be used as a monitoring and reporting tool upon final approval from the HUD program office. Upon approval, HUD will open the reporting side of the eLogic Model™ allowing you to submit actual outputs and outcomes against approved activities and projected outcomes. HUD will also open the Reporting TAB for you to meet the reporting requirements that are discussed below. The HUD program office will send you the approved eLogic Model™ to be used for reporting purposes. Identify the reporting period covered by the report in Column "I" of the worksheet lines 1, 2 and 3.

To the right of the Applicant and Project fields, there are fields labeled Period and Start Date and End Date. When actually reporting performance on your approved eLogic Model™ form, enter a Start Date and End Date that reflects the reporting period you will be submitting in accordance with required reporting time frames, e.g.; quarterly, semiannually, annually, final. For the Start Date, enter the start date of the reporting period. For End Date enter the End Date for the reporting period. When entering the dates, use the format MM/DD/YYYY.

The Reporting TAB serves two functions: 1) If applicable, use it to describe or explain actual performance as compared to what was projected and provide an explanation of any deviation (positive or negative) from the projections in your approved eLogic Model™, 2); and to respond to the Management Questions identified in the Evaluation TAB.

The worksheet labeled "Reporting" contains three large text boxes to be used by grantees when reporting. Use the reporting worksheet to add any further description or explanation about actual performance or to explain variances between projected Services or Activities and Outcomes vs. Actual Services or Activities and Outcomes.

When responding to the Management Questions, first write the Management Question followed by the response.

COMPLETING PERFORMANCE INFORMATION In YEAR1, YEAR2, YEAR3, AND TOTAL TABS.

The HUD approved eLogic Model™ will be used as a monitoring and reporting tool for your grant award. HUD will open the reporting side of the eLogic Model™ allowing you to submit actual outputs and outcomes against approved activities and projected outcomes. The HUD program office will send you the approved eLogic Model™ to be used for reporting purposes. **Identify the reporting period covered by the report in Column "I" of the worksheet lines 1, 2 and 3.**

Narrative Description - Positive/Negative Deviation from Approved Logic Model Projections
In addition to your submission of your eLogic Model™ results, you must include a narrative indicating any positive or negative deviations from projected outputs and outcomes as contained in your approved eLogic Model™ and explain the basis for the actual performance as compared to what was projected. In your narrative be sure to identify the output and outcome that you are describing from your approved eLogic Model™ and the reason why this deviation occurred. When doing this, create a paragraph header labeled, "Narrative Description - Positive/Negative Deviation from Approved Logic Model Projections".

Save the eLogic Model™ file you receive from HUD. Each time you submit your report to HUD, add the reporting period and year to the file name, e.g. HBCU-Dillard-Affordable Housing16qtr107 for a 1st quarter report, HBCU-Dillard-Affordable Housing16qtr207 for a 2nd quarter or semi-annual report, HBCU-Dillard-Affordable Housing16qtr307 for a 3rd quarter report, and HBCU-Dillard-Affordable Housing 16qtr407 for a 4th quarter or annual report, When reporting for a multiple year award, use the same format but change the year, e.g HBCU-Dillard-Affordable Housing16qtr108.

Response to Management Questions

The Management Questions are located in the Evaluation TAB. It lists the Management Questions that apply to your proposed program. Applicants who receive awards will be notified about which Management Questions will be used for monitoring accountability throughout the project. The data in your eLogic Model™ should enable you to address most or all of these Management Questions. The data collected during the course of your work and captured in the eLogic Model™ will also be useful to you in evaluating the effectiveness of your program. For eLogic Model™ Training via webcast, consult the webcast schedule found at HUD's website at http://www.hud.gov/offices/adm/grants/fundsavail.cfm. If you have any questions regarding reporting requirements, please contact your HUD program representative.

In your report and in accordance with your NOFA instructions and grant agreement, respond to the Management Questions found in the Evaluation TAB. When responding to the Management Questions, use the text box in the Reporting TAB and write the Management Question followed by the response for all Management Questions applicable to your activities.

Submission Requirements

In addition to following the reporting requirements in your award agreement, you must also submit an electronic copy. (See the FY2007 General Section of the NOFA for the HUD approved electronic formats)

eLogic Model

Applicant Name: RSITY OF ILLINOIS URBANA-CHAMPAIGN
Project Name: DDRG-UIUC
TERM: Year 1
HUD Program Doctoral

Period:
Start Date:
End Date:

US Department of Ho
OMB Approval 25

HUD Goals	Policy Priority	Problem, Need, Situation	Service or Activities/Output	Pre	Post	Outcome	Pre	Post
1		2	3	4		5	6	
Policy		Planning	Programming	Measure		Impact	Measure	
B1	A	There is insufficient relevant research activity to support housing policy analysis.	Manuscripts prepared	Manuscripts		Dissertation completed and approved	Dissertation	
	F1			1			1	
			Manuscripts prepared	Manuscripts		Dissertation published in Dissertation Abstracts or other media	Publications	
				1			1	
			Manuscripts prepared	Manuscripts		Study findings presented at conference, symposium, or other forum	Papers	
				1			3	
			Manuscripts prepared	Manuscripts		Study findings published in peer-reviewed journal	Papers	
				1			3	
			Findings examined in relation to one or more HUD Goals	Goals		Study findings address one or more HUD Goals	Goals	
				2			2	
			Findings examined in relation to one or more HUD Policy Priorities	Policy Priorities		Study findings address one or more HUD Policy Priorities	Policy Priorities	
				1			1	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	

eLogic Model™

Applicant Name: RSITY OF ILLINOIS URBANA-CHAMPAIGN
Project Name: DDRG-UIUC
TERM: Year 1
HUD Program Doctoral

Period:
Start Date:
End Date:

US Department of Ho
OMB Approval 25

HUD Goals	Policy Priority	Problem, Need, Situation	Service or Activities/Output	Pre	Post	Outcome	Pre	Post
1		2	3	4		5	6	
Policy		Planning	Programming	Measure		Impact	Measure	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	

eLogic Model™

Applicant Name: RSITY OF ILLINOIS URBANA-CHAMPAIGN
Project Name: DDRG-UIUC
TERM: Year 1
HUD Program Doctoral

Period:
Start Date:
End Date:

US Department of Ho
OMB Approval 25

HUD Goals	Policy Priority	Problem, Need, Situation	Service or Activities/Output	Pre	Post	Outcome	Pre	Post
1		2	3	4		5	6	
Policy		Planning	Programming	Measure		Impact	Measure	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	

ousing and Urban Development
535-0114 exp. 09/30/2007

Component Name:

Evaluation Tools
7
Accountability
A. Tools for Measurement
Database
Pre-post tests
B. Where Data Maintained
Specialized database
C. Source of Data
Sale documents
Tax assessments
Permits issued
Legal documents
D. Frequency of Collection
Upon incident
E. Processing of Data
Statistical database
Relational database
Computer spreadsheets

Component Name:

Evaluation Tools
7
Accountability

Component Name:

Evaluation Tools
7
Accountability

Applicant Name: ERSITY OF ILLINOIS URBANA-CHAMPAIGN
Project Name: DDRG-UIUC
TERM: Year 2
HUD Program **Doctoral**

Period:
Start Date:
End Date:

US Department of Ho
OMB Approval 25

HUD Goals	Policy Priority	Problem, Need, Situation	Service or Activities/Output	Pre	Post	Outcome	Pre	Post
1		2	3	4		5	6	
Policy		Planning	Programming	Measure		Impact	Measure	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	

US Department of Ho
OMB Approval 25

Applicant Name: RSITY OF ILLINOIS URBANA-CHAMPAIGN
Project Name: DDRG-UIUC
TERM: Year 2
HUD Program Doctoral

Period:
Start Date:
End Date:

HUD Goals	Policy Priority	Problem, Need, Situation	Service or Activities/Output	Pre	Post	Outcome	Pre	Post
1		2	3	4		5	6	
Policy		Planning	Programming	Measure		Impact	Measure	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	

US Department of Ho
OMB Approval 25

Applicant Name: RSITY OF ILLINOIS URBANA-CHAMPAIGN
Project Name: DDRG-UIUC
TERM: Year 2
HUD Program Doctoral

Period:
Start Date:
End Date:

HUD Goals	Policy Priority	Problem, Need, Situation	Service or Activities/Output	Pre	Post	Outcome	Pre	Post
1		2	3	4		5	6	
Policy		Planning	Programming	Measure		Impact	Measure	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	

ousing and Urban Development
535-0114 exp. 09/30/2007

Component Name:

0
Evaluation Tools
7
Accountability
A. Tools for Measurement
B. Where Data Maintained
C. Source of Data
D. Frequency of Collection
E. Processing of Data

ousing and Urban Development
535-0114 exp. 09/30/2007

Component Name:

0
Evaluation Tools
7

Accountability

Component Name:

0
Evaluation Tools
7

Accountability

eLogic Model™

US Department of Ho
OMB Approval 25

Applicant Name: RSITY OF ILLINOIS URBANA-CHAMPAIGN
Project Name: DDRG-UIUC
TERM: Year 3
HUD Program **Doctoral**

Period:
Start Date:
End Date:

HUD Goals	Policy Priority	Problem, Need, Situation	Service or Activities/Output	Pre	Post	Outcome	Pre	Post
1		2	3	4		5	6	
Policy		Planning	Programming	Measure		Impact	Measure	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	

eLogic Model^T

US Department of Ho
OMB Approval 25

Applicant Name: ERSITY OF ILLINOIS URBANA-CHAMPAIGN
Project Name: DDRG-UIUC
TERM: Year 3
HUD Program Doctoral

Period:
Start Date:
End Date:

HUD Goals	Policy Priority	Problem, Need, Situation	Service or Activities/Output	Pre	Post	Outcome	Pre	Post
1		2	3	4		5	6	
Policy		Planning	Programming	Measure		Impact	Measure	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	

eLogic Model™

Applicant Name: RSITY OF ILLINOIS URBANA-CHAMPAIGN
Project Name: DDRG-UIUC
TERM: Year 3
HUD Program Doctoral

Period:
Start Date:
End Date:

US Department of Ho
OMB Approval 25

HUD Goals	Policy Priority	Problem, Need, Situation	Service or Activities/Output	Pre	Post	Outcome	Pre	Post
1		2	3	4		5	6	
Policy		Planning	Programming	Measure		Impact	Measure	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	

Component Name:

0
Evaluation Tools
7
Accountability
A. Tools for Measurement
B. Where Data Maintained
C. Source of Data
D. Frequency of Collection
E. Processing of Data

Component Name:

0
Evaluation Tools
7
Accountability

Component Name:

0
Evaluation Tools
7

Accountability

eLogic Model™

Applicant Name: RSITY OF ILLINOIS URBANA-CHAMPAIGN
Project Name: DDRG-UIUC
TERM: Total
HUD Program **Doctoral**

Period:
Start Date:
End Date:

US Department of Ho
OMB Approval 25

HUD Goals	Policy Priority	Problem, Need, Situation	Service or Activities/Output	Pre	Post	Outcome	Pre	Post
1		2	3	4		5	6	
Policy		Planning	Programming	Measure		Impact	Measure	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	

eLogic Model™

Applicant Name:	RSITY OF ILLINOIS URBANA-CHAMPAIGN
Project Name:	DDRG-UIUC
TERM:	Total
HUD Program	Doctoral

Period:
Start Date:
End Date:

US Department of Ho
OMB Approval 25

HUD Goals	Policy Priority	Problem, Need, Situation	Service or Activities/Output	Pre	Post	Outcome	Pre	Post
1		2	3	4		5	6	
Policy		Planning	Programming	Measure		Impact	Measure	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	

eLogic Model™

Applicant Name: RSITY OF ILLINOIS URBANA-CHAMPAIGN
Project Name: DDRG-UIUC
TERM: Total
HUD Program **Doctoral**

Period:
Start Date:
End Date:

US Department of Ho
OMB Approval 25

HUD Goals	Policy Priority	Problem, Need, Situation	Service or Activities/Output	Pre	Post	Outcome	Pre	Post
1		2	3	4		5	6	
Policy		Planning	Programming	Measure		Impact	Measure	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	
				#N/A			#N/A	

ousing and Urban Development
535-0114 exp. 09/30/2007

Component Name:

0
Evaluation Tools
7
Accountability
A. Tools for Measurement
B. Where Data Maintained
C. Source of Data
D. Frequency of Collection
E. Processing of Data

Component Name:

0
Evaluation Tools
7
Accountability

Component Name:

0
Evaluation Tools
7
Accountability

	HUD Goals	
A1	**Increase homeownership opportunities** Expand national homeownership opportunities.	(1)
A2	**Increase homeownership opportunities** Increase minority homeownership.	(2)
A3	**Increase homeownership opportunities** Make the home-buying process less complicated and less expensive.	(3)
A4	**Increase homeownership opportunities** Reduce predatory lending practices through reform, education and enforcement.	(4)
A5	**Increase homeownership opportunities** Help HUD-assisted renters become homeowners.	(5)
A6	**Increase homeownership opportunities** Keep existing homeowners from losing their homes.	(6)
B1	**Promote Decent Affordable Housing.** Expand access to and availability of decent, affordable rental housing.	(1)
B2	**Promote Decent Affordable Housing.** Improve the management accountability and physical quality of public and assisted housing.	(2)
B3	**Promote Decent Affordable Housing.** Improve housing opportunities for the elderly and persons with disabilities.	(3)
B4	**Promote Decent Affordable Housing.** Promote housing self-sufficiency	(4)
B5	**Promote Decent Affordable Housing.** Facilitate more effective delivery of affordable housing by reforming public housing and the Housing Choice Voucher program..	(5)
C1	**Strengthen Communities.** Assist disaster recovery in the Gulf Coast region.	(1)
C2	**Strengthen Communities.** Enhance sustainability of communities by expanding economic opportunities.	(2)
C3	**Strengthen Communities.** Foster a suitable living environment in communities by improving physical conditions and quality of life.	(3)
C4	**Strengthen Communities.** chronic homelessness and move homeless families and individuals to permanent housing.	(4) End
C5	**Strengthen Communities.** Mitigate housing conditions that threaten health.	(5)
D1	**Ensure Equal Opportunity in Housing.** Ensure access to a fair and effective administrative process to investigate and resolve complaints of discrimination.	(1)
D2	**Ensure Equal Opportunity in Housing.** Improve public awareness of rights and responsibilities under fair housing laws.	(2)
D3	**Ensure Equal Opportunity in Housing.** Improve housing accessibility for persons with disabilities.	(3)
D4	**Ensure Equal Opportunity in Housing.** Ensure that HUD-funded entities comply with fair housing and other civil rights laws.	(4)
E1	**Embrace High Standards of Ethics, Management, and Accountability.** (1) Strategically manage human capital to increase employee satisfaction and improve HUD performance.	
E2	**Embrace High Standards of Ethics, Management, and Accountability.** (2) Improve HUD's management and its internal controls to ensure program compliance and resolve audit issues	
E3	**Embrace High Standards of Ethics, Management, and Accountability.** (3) Improve accountability, service delivery, and customer service of HUD and its partners.	

	HUD Priorities	
A	**Providing Increased Homeownership and Rental Opportunities for Low- and Moderate-Income Persons, Persons with Disabilities, the Elderly, Minorities, and Persons with Limited English Proficiency.**	
B1	**Improve our Nation's Communities.** Bring private capital into distressed communities;	(1)
B2	**Improve our Nation's Communities.** Finance business investments to grow new businesses;	(2)
B3	**Improve our Nation's Communities.** Maintain and expand existing businesses;	(3)
B4	**Improve our Nation's Communities.** Create a pool of funds for new small and minority-owned businesses;	(4)
B5	**Improve our Nation's Communities.** Create decent jobs for low-income persons.	(5)
B6	**Improve our Nation's Communities.** Improve the environmental health and safety of families living in public and privately owned housing	(6)
C1	**Encouraging Accessible Design Features.** Visitability in New Construction and Substantial Rehabilitation.	(1)
C2	**Encouraging Accessible Design Features.** Universal Design.	(2)
D1	**Providing Full and Equal Access to Grassroots Faith-Based and Other Community Organizations in HUD Program Implementation.**	
E	**Participation of Minority-Serving Institutions (MSIs) in HUD Programs.**	
F1	**Ending Chronic Homelessness.** Creation of affordable housing units, supportive housing, and group homes;	(1)
F2	**Ending Chronic Homelessness.** Establishment of a set-aside of units of affordable housing for the chronically homeless;	(2)
F3	**Ending Chronic Homelessness.** Establishment of substance abuse treatment programs targeted to the homeless population;	(3)
F4	**Ending Chronic Homelessness.** Establishment of job training programs that will provide opportunities for economic self-sufficiency;	(4)
F5	**Ending Chronic Homelessness.** Establishment of counseling programs that assist homeless persons in finding housing, managing finances, managing anger, and building interpersonal relationships;	(5)
F6	**Ending Chronic Homelessness.** Provision of supportive services, such as health care assistance that will permit homeless individuals to become productive members of society;	(6)
F7	**Ending Chronic Homelessness.** Provision of service coordinators or one-stop assistance centers that will ensure that chronically homeless persons have access to a variety of social services.	(7)
G	**Removal of Regulatory Barriers to Affordable Housing.**	
H	**Participation in Energy Star.**	

E4	**Embrace High Standards of Ethics, Management, and Accountability.** (4) Capitalize on modernized technology to improve the delivery of HUD's core business functions.		[redacted]
F1	**Promote Participation of Faith-Based and Other Community Organizations.** Reduce barriers to faith-based and other community organizations.	(1)	[redacted]
F2	**Promote Participation of Faith-Based and Other Community Organizations.** Conduct outreach and provide technical assistance to strengthen the capacity of faith-based and	(2)	[redacted]
F3	**Promote Participation of Faith-Based and Other Community Organizations.** Encourage partnerships between faith-based and other community organizations and HUD's grantees	(3)	[redacted]

CAMP *e*Logic Model™

Copy to Column 2

PROBLEM, NEEDS, SITUATION
There is insufficient relevant research activity to support housing policy analysis.
There are not enough trained investigators addressing housing policy issues.

CAMP

CAMP *e*Logic Model™

Click here to allow deletion of 'New' Activities

Copy to Column 3

SERVICES OR ACTIVITIES/OUTPUTS	UNITS
Faculty approve statistical methods of analysis	Analysis
Faculty approve study design	Design
Findings examined in relation to one or more HUD Goals	Goals
Findings examined in relation to one or more HUD Policy Priorities	Policy Priorities
Manuscripts prepared	Manuscripts
Original data collected	Data Collected
Relevant data sets acquired	Data Sets
other	other

CAMP *e*Logic Model™

Click here to allow deletion of 'New' Outcomes

Copy to Column 5

ACHIEVEMENT OUTCOMES GOALS AND INDICATORS	UNITS
Dissertation completed and approved	Dissertation
Dissertation published in Dissertation Abstracts or other media	Publications
Study findings address one or more HUD Goals	Goals
Study findings address one or more HUD Policy Priorities	Policy Priorities
Study findings presented at conference, symposium, or other forum	Papers
Study findings published in non peer-reviewed media	Papers
Study findings published in peer-reviewed journal	Papers
Study project completed and approved by faculty	Approved Project
other	other

CAMP eLogic Model™

A. Tools For Measurement
Bank accounts
Construction log
Database
Enforcement log
Financial aid log
Intake log
Interviews
Mgt. Info. System-automated
Mgt. Info. System-manual
Outcome scale(s)
Phone log
Plans
Pre-post tests
Post tests
Program specific form(s)
Questionnaire
Recruitment log
Survey
Technical assistance log
Time sheets

B. Where Data Maintained
Agency database
Centralized database
Individual case records
Local precinct
Public database
School
Specialized database
Tax Assessor database
Training center

C. Source of Data
Audit report
Business licenses
Certificate of Occupancy
Code violation reports
Counseling reports
Employment records
Engineering reports
Environmental reports
Escrow accounts
Financial reports
GED certification/diploma
Health records
HMIS
Inspection results
Lease agreements
Legal documents
Loan monitoring reports
Mortgage documents
Payment vouchers
Permits issued
Placements
Progress reports
Referrals
Sale documents
Site reports
Statistics
Tax assessments
Testing results
Waiting lists
Work plan reports

D. Frequency of Collection
Daily
Weekly
Monthly
Quarterly
Biannually
Annually
Upon incident

E. Processing of Data
Computer spreadsheets
Flat file database
Manual tallies
Relational database
Statistical database

Explanation of Any Deviations From the Approved eLogic Model

Response to Management Questions

Response to Management Questions

Evaluation Process

These are standard requirements that HUD will expect every program manager receiving a grant to do as part of their project management.

- An evaluation process will be part of the on-going management of the program.
- Comparisons will be made between projected and actual numbers for both outputs and outcomes.
- Deviations from projected outputs and outcomes will be documented and explained on space provided on the "Reporting" tab
- Analyze data to determine relationship of outputs to outcomes:

The reporting requirements are specified in the program specific NOFA and your funding award.

HUD Will Use The Following Management Questions To Evaluate Your Program

1. How many units were retrofitted to meet accessibility requirements, building codes, and health and safety standards?
2. How much common space was retrofitted to meet accessibility requirements, building codes, and health and safety standards?
3. How much common space was retrofitted for ALF staff?
4. How many new or modified central kitchen or dining rooms were created to support ALF?
5. How many persons were maintained their own residence as a result of the ALCP?
6. How many persons avoided placement into a long-term care facility?
7. How many services were provided to residents?
8. How many linkages were provided to residents?
9. What is the value of linked or referred services provided by other community-based organizations?

Carter-Richmond Methodology

The above Management Questions developed for your program are based on the Carter-Richmond Methodology[1]. A description of the Carter-Richmond Methodology appears in the General Section of the NOFA.

[1] © The Accountable Agency – How to Evaluate the Effectiveness of Public and Private Programs," Reginald Carter, ISBN Number 9780978724924.