**EMERGENCY SOLUTIONS GRANT**

**GRANT REVIEW SCORING GUIDE**

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

**Sub factor 1:** Non-Profit & Staff Experience with Grant Administration – 10 pts

**Sub factor 2:** Program Sustainability Outlook – 10 pts

### CONSIDERING FACTORS

* Does the non-profit have an experienced staff?
* Does the non-profit have local, state, or federal licenses/certificates?
* Does the proposed program seem to complement the non-profit’s Mission Statement?
* Does the non-profit demonstrate that they have the staff experience and proper level of staffing to carry out the project?

*Evaluate how well the non-profit demonstrates the ability to successfully implement and manage grant funded (federal, state, and local) projects in a timely manner, consistent with funding requirements AND the non-profit’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**: Consolidated Plan Consistency/Priority

**Sub factor 2**: Meeting a Community Need

### CONSIDERING FACTORS

* Does the non-profit address root causes versus a band-aid approach?
* How do the services help meet client and community needs?
* Are current local statistics, non-profit 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?*

## 2015-2019 Mississippi Consolidated Plan Priorities in Program Focus Areas

## *High Priorities (Max points awarded: 1 activity @ 8 points ea.)*

## Services for At-risk Children/Youth/Victim of Human Trafficking

## Services for Persons with Serious Mental Illness

## *Medium Priorities (Max points awarded: 2 activities @ 4 points ea.)*

## Homeless Services

## Services for Victims of Domestic Violence

## Emergency Food Assistance

## Parent Education

## *Low Priorities (Max points awarded: 2 activities @ 2 points ea.)*

## Utility Assistance

## Financial Literacy

## Services for Persons Recently Incarcerated or on Parole

## Service for Persons with Substance Abuse Problems

## Other General Low/Moderate Income Services

## Rating Factor 3: Collaboration (20 Points)

**Sub factor 1**: Are there Partnerships and Collaborations? – 15 pts

**Sub factor 2**: Outreach and Referrals – 5 pts

### CONSIDERING FACTORS

* Does the non-profit actively refer *clients to other needed services?*
* Does the proposed program include *coordination efforts between multiple partners including: Education, Faith-Based, Arts, Media, Government, Non-Profits, Business, Entertainment, Sports and Neighborhoods?*
* Does the non-profit *collaborate with other agencies* to provide comprehensive services?
* Does the non-profit 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 non-profit 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 non-profit participation within the local community, including its collaborative efforts with other agencies and committees. Do the non-profit participate in the Continuum of Care (CoC) and CoC related activities? ESG grant recipients are required to participate in the CoC.*

## Rating Factor 4: Program Evaluation, Performance & Monitoring (20 Points)

**Sub factor 1**: Are Accomplishments Measurable? – 5 pts

**Sub factor 2**: Standardized Client Intake and Eligibility Process – 5 pts

**Sub factor 3:** Standardized Methods and Tools to Evaluate Progress – 5 pts

**Sub factor 4:** Monitoring Results & Timeliness – 5 pts

### CONSIDERING FACTORS

* + How did the non-profit perform in terms of numbers served in the previous grant cycle?
  + Has the non-profit had any issues with expending all their past or current funding?
  + Are there any serious performance issues in past grants awarded to the non-profit?
  + Is the non-profit 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 non-profit track accomplishments over time and have verifiable accomplishments?
  + Is there a strong link between the project goals, the services provided and the outcomes?
  + Are there significant discrepancies between the agency’s answers & the performance reports from the HUD CAPER report?

*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?*

This section is based on a combination of HUD CAPER reports reflecting past expenditures and grants awarded through ESG that will be made available to the reviewing panel. The timeliness of drawing down of grant funds and meeting of their targeted number of clients to be assisted will be evaluated.

**Rating Factor 5: Financial (10 Points)**

**Sub factor 1**: Clear and Efficient Budget – 5 pts

**Sub factor 2**: Leveraging Sources (Private, Federal, State, Local, In-Kind) – 5 pts

### CONSIDERING FACTORS

* Does the non-profit identify source of operating funds that will fund services before they are reimbursed by ESG?
* Does the proposed program have significant amounts of other funding?
* If the requested ESG funding is not awarded can the non-profit 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 whether the 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 non-profit 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: Grant Submittal (10 Points)**

**Sub factor 1**: Is the Application Clear – 5 pts

**Sub factor 2**: Application Completeness – 5 pts

### CONSIDERING FACTORS

* Did the non-profit submit one original and one copy of the application?
* Is the application clear and accurate?
* Were there any confusing statements in the application?
* Did the application include all necessary documentations and attachments?