EMERGENCY SOLUTIONS GRANTS PROGRAMS
(ESG) AND (CA-ESG)
FISCAL YEAR 2019-2020
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 familiar with administering federal or state funded programs?
- Does the Agency have Local, State, or Federal licenses/certificates?
- Is the Agency experienced in carrying out the proposed program?
- Does the proposed program seem to fit in with the Agency's Mission Statement?
- Does the Agency demonstrate that they have the experienced and proper level of staffing and staff's availability 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, performance reporting, etc.).

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

  Sub factor 1: Prevention Focus

  Sub factor 2: Consistent with Adopted Consolidated Plan/Priority Need

  Sub factor 3: Identifying and Addressing a Community Need

CONSIDERING FACTORS
- Does the proposed program provide preventative support/activities to program participants?
- Does the proposed program address root causes and long-term conditions versus a band-aid approach?
- Are current local statistics, agency statistics, or other evidence provided to document and support the proposed programs approach to addressing community need and gaps in service?
- Is a target population and their unique service needs clearly identified?
- Is the proposed program designed to improve client wellbeing through a collaborative approach and coordinated access to resources?

Evaluate how well the proposed program addresses community need while working collaboratively to address gaps in services and root causes in an effort to assist homeless persons to permanently escape homelessness and prevent those at risk of homelessness from becoming homeless.

Rating Factor 3: Collaboration (20 Points)

Sub factor 1: Does the Proposed Program Incorporate a Cross Sector Engagement Strategy?

Sub factor 2: Are there Partnerships and Collaborations?

Sub factor 3: Outreach and Referrals

CONSIDERING FACTORS
- Does the Agency actively refer clients to other needed services?
- Does the Agency collaborate with other agencies to provide comprehensive 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 have an effective client outreach strategy?
- Will the proposed program help meet needs and promote increased self-sufficiency?
- Did the Agency provide 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? Recently? Or do they have a history of community involvement?

Evaluate the outreach activities and how effective the program 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/CA-ESG grant recipients are required to participate in the CoC.

Rating Factor 4: Accomplishments & Program Evaluation (40 Points)

Sub factor 1: Standardized Client Intake and Eligibility Process

Sub factor 2: Standardized Methods and Tools to Evaluate Progress

Sub factor 3: HMIS Proficiency, Training and Deadlines

CONSIDERING FACTORS
- Can the Agency provide information on the number of clients served in previous years?
- Does the Agency have verifiable accomplishments?
- How did the Agency perform in terms of numbers served?
- Does the Agency track accomplishments over time?
- Does the Agency's method of tracking accomplishments extend over a reasonable period of time?
- Does the Agency's tracking methods sound reasonable and or efficient?
- 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?

- Is there a strong link between the outcomes, the project goals, and the services provided?
- Does the Agency have dedicated staff to enter data directly into HMIS or does an outside agency assist?
- If the Agency enters data into HMIS, have they had any issues in the system or issues with reporting requirements to an Entitlement jurisdiction or the CoC?
- Has the Agency met all their HMIS reporting deadlines within the last 12 months?
- Does the Agency staff have the familiarity and/or capacity to screen clients through the VI-SPDAT in the HMIS system?

Evaluate the effectiveness of how proposed program outcomes and performance will be measured. Are the methods and tools to be used to evaluate progress clearly described? Are long-term goals verifiable and attainable and will the program be impactful and effective in meeting needs and gaps in services?

Annual Performance Reports (APRs), as submitted to the County and reflected in HUD ESG CAPER reports, will be available to the Grant 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.

In addition to other federal requirements, HMIS reporting timeliness will be measured heavily in Rating Factor 4. Accurate and timely reporting of program data is of the utmost importance and must be met by the County in order to remain in federal and state compliance for the ESG and CA-ESG programs. Can the Agency ensure that they will have dedicated proficient staff that will continue in their on-going training of the HMIS system and reporting requirements and meet deadlines?

Rating Factor 5: Financials (20 Points)

Sub factor 1: Clear and Efficient Budget

Sub factor 2: Leveraging Sources (Private, Federal, State, Local and In-Kind)

CONSIDERING FACTORS
- Does the proposed program identify other sources of funding?
- If the requested ESG/CA-ESG funding is not awarded can the Agency still implement the program?
- Does the program budget reflect awarded funding or pending funding from other sources?
- Is there a reasonable amount of committed funding to cover the costs of the proposed program with or without the requested ESG/CA-ESG funds?
- In the past was the program funded with other funding, if so why did it stop?

Evaluate if program 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 program leverage other federal, state, local or private resources? Does the agency provide evidence of sustainable funding? Evaluate program sources and costs to determine if they are reasonable and well supported.

Rating Factor 6: Performance & Risk Assessment (20 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?
– Will the agency rely on any outside agencies in order to implement the proposed program? If so, are there solid commitments to this program? How will they monitor those outside agencies?
– 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 ESG CAPER report?

Evaluate any relevant performance benchmarks. Is there a plan for dealing with any perceived barriers or challenges such as lack of affordable housing units? If the program is unable to meet a benchmark, is there a plan for what the program 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? If proposing rapid re-housing, has the agency demonstrated a plan to addressing private sector housing constraints?

_____

Rating Factor 7: Program Innovation (30 Points)

  Sub factor 1: Program Innovation

CONSIDERING FACTORS
– Does the proposed program introduce an innovative approach, idea, process, project, etc that clearly changes or improves the services proposed/provided?
– Does the proposed program go beyond the usual approach?
– If the proposed program was previously funded, what is the added value to the current proposal?

Evaluate the proposed program for an approach that goes beyond the same service model already being used in the community by the applicant or another service provider. For applicants requesting funding for an existing program, innovation should not be based only on the expansion of client numbers, locations, or new activities; and may include changes to the service delivery model designed to enhance results. Does the grant application include sufficient information to clearly demonstration an innovative approach?

Rating Factor 8: Grant Submittal (10 Points)

   <u>**Sub factor 1:**</u> <u>Is the Grant Application Clear</u>?

   <u>**Sub factor 2:**</u> <u>Presentation Value</u>

CONSIDERING FACTORS
- Were there any confusing statements in the grant application by the applicant that could not be explained?
- Were all concerns and questions answered by grant application and the presenter(s)?
- Is the proposed program clear and accurate?
- Does the presentation align with the submitted grant application?
- Did the presentation clear up any concerns or questions regarding the grant application?
- Were the presenters able to completely answer the questions from the Grant Review Panel?