



**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT (CDBG)  
PUBLIC SERVICES GRANT (PSG) AND FAIR HOUSING SERVICES (FH)  
FISCAL YEAR 2023-2024 (FY 23-24)  
GRANT REVIEW PANEL SCORING GUIDE**

---

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

**Subfactor 1: Agency and Staff Experience with Grant Administration**

**Subfactor 2: Program Sustainability Outlook**

***Considering Factors***

- Does the agency have 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 staff and proper level of staffing and staff availability to carry out the program?

*Evaluate how well the agency demonstrates the ability to successfully implement and manage publicly 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)**

**Subfactor 1: Prevention Focus**

**Subfactor 2: Consistency with Adopted Consolidated Plan/Priority Need**

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

---

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

**Subfactor 1: Does the Proposed Program Incorporate A Cross Sector Engagement Strategy?**

**Subfactor 2: Are there Partnerships and Collaborations?**

**Subfactor 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?
- 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?

*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 local 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 and Program Evaluation (20 Points)**

**Subfactor 1: Are Accomplishments Measurable?**

**Subfactor 2: Standardized Methods and Tools to Evaluate Progress**

**Subfactor 3: Are Program Goals Verifiable and Attainable?**

**Subfactor 4: Will the Program be Impactful and Effective?**

**Subfactor 5: Use of Racial Equity Assessment**

***Considering Factors***

- Can the agency provide information on the number of clients served in previous years?
- If previously funded, 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 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?
- Does the agency have verifiable accomplishments?

- Does the agency track accomplishments over time?
- Is there a strong link between the outcomes, the program goals, and the services provided?
- Does the agency analyze the specific outcomes for racial and ethnic groups?
- Does the agency implement policies and procedures to make progress toward eliminating racial inequalities and provide inclusion?
- Can the agency explain how it will be implemented and evaluated in an equitable way?

*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?*

HUD strongly recommends that grantees should prioritize the advancement of racial equity and inclusion at all levels of the programs funded. Applicants will need to demonstrate how they will provide for and improve access to services, services provision, and outcomes among disproportionately underrepresented populations. Applicants are strongly encouraged to use racial equity resources, data toolkits, and research reports to identify disparities and implement responses. Please visit the [HUD Exchange Racial Equity](#) website for additional information.

This section is based on a combination of Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation (CAPER) reports reflecting past expenditures and grants awarded through County CDBG and 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 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 (20 Points)**

### **Subfactor 1: Clear and Efficient Budget**

### **Subfactor 2: Leveraging Sources (Private, Federal, State, Local and In-Kind)**

#### ***Considering Factors***

- Does the proposed program identify other sources of funding?
- If the requested CDBG 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 guaranteed commitment of funding to cover the costs of the proposed program?
- 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 and Risk Assessment (20 Points)**

### **Subfactor 1: Implementation-Soundness of Approach**

### **Subfactor 2: Monitoring Results and 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?
- 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 audit findings?
- Are there any serious performance issues in past grants awarded to the agency?
- Are there any inconsistencies between the agency's answers and 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 benchmarks? 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?*

This section is based on a combination of HUD CAPER reports reflecting past expenditures and grants awarded through County CDBG grants.

## **Rating Factor 7: Program Innovation (30 Points)**

### **Subfactor 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 program application include sufficient information to clearly demonstrate an innovative approach?*

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

### **Subfactor 1: Is the Grant Application Clear?**

### **Subfactor 2: Presentation Value**

#### ***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?