

PUBLIC SERVICES GRANT & EMERGENCY SOLUTIONS GRANT  
**GRANT REVIEW SCORING GUIDE**

---

**Rating Factor 1: Capacity & Experience (20 Points)**

**Sub factor 1: Agency & Staff Experience with Grant Administration**

**Sub factor 2: Program Sustainability Outlook**

**CONSIDERING FACTORS**

- Does the Agency have an experienced staff?
- Does the Agency have Local, State, or Federal licenses/certificates
- Is the Agency experienced in carrying out the proposed program/activity?
- Does the proposed program seem to fit in with the Agency's Mission Statement?
- Does the Agency demonstrate that they have the staff experience and proper level of staffing to carry out the project?

*Evaluate how well the Agency demonstrates the ability to successfully implement and manage publically funded (federal, state, and local) projects in a timely manner, consistent with funding requirements AND the Agency's experience working with similar programs (housing programs, emergency shelters, outreach, etc.) or programs with similar activities (case management, assessments, etc.).*

---

**Rating Factor 2: Need/Extent of the Problem (20 Points)**

**Sub factor 1: Prevention Focus**

***PSG Applications Only***

**Sub factor 2: Consolidated Plan Consistency/Priority**

**Sub factor 3: Meeting a Community Need**

**CONSIDERING FACTORS**

- Does the proposed program have a prevention focus?
- Does the proposed program address root causes versus a band-aid approach?
- How do the services help meet client and community needs?
- Are current local statistics, agency statistics or other evidence provided to document and support the need?
- Is the target population and their unique service needs clearly identified?

*Evaluate the identified community need in the context of the priorities for the proposed services. How comprehensive is the description of the related need for the services proposed? Evaluate how well services are located as compared to need in community. Is the target population and their unique service needs clearly identified?*

**2015-2020 Consolidated Plan Priorities in Program Focus Areas**

High Priorities – 5

Services for At-risk Children/Youth  
Senior Services  
Services for Physically/Mentally Disabled Persons

Medium Priorities - 3

Homeless Services  
Services for Victims of Domestic Violence  
Emergency Food Assistance

Parent Education

Low Priorities - 1

Utility Assistance

**Rating Factor 3: Collaboration (20 Points)**

**Sub factor 1: Does Project Include Cross Sector Engagements?**

**Sub factor 2: Is there Partnerships and Collaborations?**

**Sub factor 3: Outreach and Referrals**

**CONSIDERING FACTORS**

- Does the Agency actively refer clients to other needed services?
- Does the proposed program include coordination efforts between multiple sectors including: Education, Faith-Based, Arts, Media, Government, Non-Profits, Business, Entertainment, Sports and Neighborhoods.
- Does the Agency collaborate with other agencies to provide comprehensive services?
- Does the Agency have an effective client outreach strategy?
- Do these services help meet needs and promote increased self-sufficiency?
- Are there details of any formal agreements and history of partnerships in the community?
- Is the Agency demonstrating that they are not working in a silo and have established true partnerships throughout the County.

*Evaluate the outreach activities and how effective the project will be in reaching the target population. How are any barriers described, and how will they be addressed? Evaluate the degree of agency participation within the local community, including its collaborative efforts with other agencies and committees. Does the agency participate in the Stanislaus Continuum of Care (CoC) and CoC related activities. ESG grant recipients are required to participate in the CoC. All other grantees will be strongly encouraged to participate in the CoC.*

---

**Rating Factor 4: Accomplishments & Program Evaluation (20 Points- PSG/10 Points- ESG)**

**Sub factor 1: Are Accomplishments Measurable?** ***PSG Applications Only***

**Sub factor 1: Standardized Client Intake and Eligibility Process** ***ESG Applications Only***

**Sub factor 2: Standardized Methods and Tools to Evaluate Progress**

**Sub factor 3: Are Long-term Goals Verifiable and Attainable?** ***PSG Application Only***

**Sub factor 4: Will Program be Impactful and Effective?** ***PSG Application Only***

**CONSIDERING FACTORS**

- How did the Agency perform in terms of numbers served in previous grant cycles?
- Does the Agency's method of tracking accomplishments extend over a reasonable period of time?
- Do their methods sound reasonable?
- Is the Agency proposing activities that will help clients move towards self-sufficiency after they receive the service?
- Can they clearly define how clients will be better off and reach self-sufficiency after receiving proposed services?
- Does the Agency have verifiable accomplishments?
- Does the Agency track accomplishments over time?
- Is there a strong link between the outcomes, the project goals, and the services provided?

*Evaluate the effectiveness of how proposed program outcomes and performance will be measured, including the program/agency review process and use of relevant methods and tools. Are the methods and tools to be used to evaluate progress clearly described?*

This section is based on a combination of HUD CAPER reports reflecting past expenditures and grants awarded through County CDBG & ESG grants that will be made available to the reviewing panel. ESG applicants only- Annual Performance Reports (APRs), as submitted to the County and reflected in HUD CAPER reports, will be available to the review panel. The timeliness of drawing down of grant funds and meeting of their targeted number of clients to be assisted, as reflected in public reports, will be evaluated.

---

## **Rating Factor 5: Financials (10 Points)**

### **Sub factor 1: Clear and Efficient Budget**

### **Sub factor 2: Leveraging Sources (Private, Fed, State, Local, In-Kind)**

#### **CONSIDERING FACTORS**

- Does the proposed program have significant amounts of other funding?
- If the requested CDBG or/ESG funding is not awarded can the Agency still implement the program?
- Does the budget reflect awarded funding or pending funding from other sources?
- Is there a guaranteed commitment of funding to cover the costs of the proposed program?
- In the past was the project funded with other funding, if so why did it stop?

*Evaluate project budget estimates and costs are reasonable and well supported or justified relative to the number of persons to be served, the services to be provided, and the target population. Does the project leverage other federal, state, local or private resources? Does the agency provide evidence of sustainable funding? Evaluate project sources and costs to determine if they are reasonable and well supported. Is the project budget relative to the proposed numbers of individuals and/or households to be assisted.*

---

## **Rating Factor 6: Performance & Risk Assessment (10 Points)**

### **Sub factor 1: Implementation-Soundness of Approach**

### **Sub factor 2: Monitoring Results & Timeliness**

#### **CONSIDERING FACTORS**

- How will the proposed services be implemented?
- Who will implement the proposed services?
- What will be the frequency and duration of the proposed services?
- Has the Agency had any issues with expending all their past or current funding?
- Are there any serious performance issues in past grants awarded to the Agency?
- Are there any inconsistencies between the Agency's answers & the performance reports from the HUD CAPER report?

*Evaluate any relevant performance benchmarks. Is there a plan for dealing with any perceived barriers to meeting or exceeding these? If the project is unable to meet a benchmark, is there a plan for what the project can offer in the first year, and how it can move closer to meeting or exceeding the target in the second year? Are the methods and tools to be used to evaluate progress clearly described?*

This section is based on a combination of HUD CAPER reports reflecting past expenditures and grants awarded through County CDBG & ESG grants. ESG applicants only- Annual Performance Reports (APRs) will be available to the review panel. The timeliness drawing down of grant funds and meeting of their targeted number of clients to be assisted will be evaluated.

---

**Rating Factor 7: Project Innovation (20 Points)**

**Sub factor 1: Project Innovation**

**CONSIDERING FACTORS**

- Does the proposed program introduce an innovation that substantially improves the services proposed/provided?
  - Will there be an expansion of services, are details provided?
  - Does the proposed program go beyond the usual approach by showing it addresses a new need and/or issue or addresses a population need and/or issue that has yet to be addressed?
  - If the proposed program was previously funded what is the added value to this year's proposed program?
- 

**Rating Factor 8: Grant Submittal (10 Points)**

**Sub factor 1: Is the Application Clear?**

**Sub factor 2: Presentation Value**

**CONSIDERING FACTORS**

- Were there any confusing statements in the application by the applicants that could not be explained?
- Were all concerns and questions answered by application and the presenters?
- Is the proposed program clear and accurate?
- Does the presentation align with the submitted application?
- Did the presentation clear up any concerns or questions regarding the application?
- Were the presenters able to answer questions fully?