2017 DRAFT ESG Scorecard

The Orange County Partnership to End Homelessness will use this scorecard for Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) applications awarded by the State of North Carolina. The goal of this scorecard is to fund organizations that:

- Have capacity to run effective programs
- Further efforts to end homelessness in Orange County
- Are active community partners in the ongoing work to end homelessness in Orange County
- Achieve excellent outcomes

[References in brackets indicate the materials that will be used to score each question.]

Reviewer:					
Applicant:					
Project Name:					
Project Type (select all)	☐ SO	☐ ES	☐ HP	☐ RRH	☐ HMIS
Reviewer Signature:				Date:	

Project Review & Ranking: The ESG Funding Committee will score project applications and make funding recommendations to the OCPEH Leadership Team. The Leadership Team will make the final funding recommendations. Lower scoring projects may be recommended above higher scoring projects, if the lower scoring projects address a community priority activity or subpopulation that a higher scoring project does not address. The Partnership may ask applicant agencies to provide additional information to determine agency capacity.

Project Threshold Requirements: Should a project not meet Threshold Requirements, the Orange County Partnership to End Homelessness (OCPEH) Coordinator will contact the applying agency to describe the problem area(s).

Appeals Process: Agencies wishing to appeal can communicate in writing specific examples of how the agency meets Threshold Requirements by October 25, 2017. Appeals concerning Threshold Requirements will be considered by the OCPEH Leadership Team. Appeals of Leadership Team decisions can be directed to the State ESG Office in the Division of Aging & Adult Services in the NC Department of Health & Human Services.

Maximum Scores by Project Type:
- Street Outreach: 99
- Emergency Shelter: 114
- Homelessness Prevention: 99
- Rapid Re-Housing: 119
- Homeless Management Information System (HMIS): 104

Scorecard Instructions: Sections I-IV apply to all activities and will be added together for a general section score and entered in the table below. Section V includes the five eligible activities funded through Emergency Solutions Grant funding. To compare applicants in the competition, the individual score for each activity will be added to the total general section score for a complete score for the activity type. The complete score for each activity type will then be converted to a percentage to enable comparison to scores for other activity types. Section VI offers bonus points to projects that submit a Self-Evaluation of the project using this Scorecard.

Scoring Table

Activity Type	Sections I-IV Score	Activity Section Score (Sections V+VI)	Total Score (Section I-IV) + (Activity Section Score)	Total Score (as a Percentage)
Street Outreach (99 pts)				
Emergency Shelter (114 pts)				
Homelessness Prevention (99 pts)				
Rapid Re-housing (119 pts)				
HMIS (104 pts)				

Section I: Organization Information

Section I Score

Possible Points: 0

Consistency with Mission	Possible Score	Project Score
1.1 Does the project fit within the mission of the agency? Does the agency currently serve homeless households in their community? *[Project Application: Q3.1 – Q4.2, Q11.1]*	Threshold ☐ met ☐ unmet	

Section II: Organizational Capacity and Stability

Section II Score

Possible Points: 24

Financial Capacity		Possible Score	Project Score
2.1	Does the agency have an adequate financial control system and procedure to monitor its activities and ensure that ESG dollars are spent in a timely manner? *[Project Application: Q7.2]*	Threshold ☐ met unmet	☐
2.11	Did the agency have an independent audit? *[Project Application: Q7.4]*	☐ met unmet	☐
2.12	Does the most recent audit reflect expenses of $750,000 or more of Federal funds? *If yes, did organization comply with requirements under OMB Circular A-133? [Project Application: Q7.4]*	☐ Yes ☐ Yes	☐ No ☐ No
2.2	Does the agency have any HUD findings in the last 5 years? *[Project Application: Q7.3]*		
	Yes	0	
	No	2	
2.3	If the agency has HUD findings in the last 5 years, did the agency attach an approved Corrective Action Plan? *[Project Application: Q7.3.1]*		
	Yes	0	
	No	Further Review	
2.4	Did the agency show positive or equal income versus expenses in the fiscal year? *[Project Application: Q7.4]*		
	All 3 years	7	
	2 out 3 years	4	
	1 out of 3 years	1	
	0 years	Further review	
Past Awards			
2.6	Did the agency have a timely expenditure of ESG funds in the previous grant year or the agency's most recent ESG grant year? *[Project Application: Q9.1.1]*		
	75%+	15	

		60-74%	5	
		Below 60%	Further review	
		Not a grantee	NA	

Section III: Staff Capacity

Section III Score

Possible Points: 10

Staff Information			Possible Score	Project Score
3.1	Does the program have staff capacity to adequately administer the ESG program without a heavy reliance on volunteers? *[Project Application: Q10.1 - Q10.3]*		Threshold ☐ met	☐ unmet
Experience				
3.2	Does the agency have adequate experience to implement the activities proposed in the application? Description should include years of experience of staff/agency and staff/agency challenges and plan to address them. *[Project Application: Q11.1]*		Threshold ☐ met	☐ unmet
Coordinated Entry				
3.4	Does the agency agree to participate in OCPEH coordinated entry? *[Project Application: Q13.1]*		Threshold ☐ met	☐ unmet
3.5	Does the agency currently participate in OCPEH coordinated entry?			
		Yes	10	
		No	0	
Written Standards				
3.6	Does the agency affirm that it will run its programs in adherence to OCPEH Written Standards and participate in program oversight process the CoC designs? *[Project Application: Q14.1]*		Threshold ☐ met	☐ unmet

Section IV: Data

Section IV Score

Possible Points: 10

Data Collection				
4.1	Does the agency collect all Universal Data Elements and use a database that allows the user to enter the information? *[Project Application: Q16.1]*			
		Yes	5	
		No	Further Review	
4.3	Does the agency have an adequate plan to ensure compliance with HMIS requirements (or comparable database), including staffing, data entry, and data quality standards, that includes oversight by agency administration? *[Project Application: Q16.4]*			

	Yes	5		
	No	0		

HMIS (For non-DV and non- victims service providers only)

4.4	Does the agency have an HMIS Agency Administrator to enter data, pull reports, and attend user meetings? *[Project Application: Q17.1]*	Threshold ☐ met ☐ unmet ☐ N/A

Domestic Violence HMIS Comparable Database (For DV and victims service providers only)

4.6	Can the comparable database the agency uses produce the ESG CAPER directly from the database? If not, will the agency commit to having a comparable database capable of complying with reporting requirements prior to project start date? *[Project Application: Q18.2]*	Threshold ☐ met ☐ unmet ☐ N/A

Section V: Activities

Activity Score

Reviewers should only fill out the applicable section for the activity or activities for which the applicant applied. Possible Points (not including optional Bonus Points in Section VI): SO: 55 ES: 70 HP: 55 RRH: 75 HMIS: 60	SO:
	ES:
	HP
	RRH:
	HMIS:

Street Outreach	**Possible Score**	**Project Score**
Street Outreach Project Description		
5.1 Does the project serve priority subpopulation(s)? *[Project Application: Q19.1]*	Yes=5 No=0	
Street Outreach Design and Philosophy		
5.3 Does the project description demonstrate a sound understanding of street outreach activities and an ability to engage unsheltered individuals and/or families to connect them to emergency services and permanent housing? *[Project Application: Q20.1, Q20.5, Q20.6]*	Yes=15 No=0	
5.4 Did the agency check any of the boxes in Q20.2 or Q20.3? *[Project Application: Q20.2 – Q20.3]*		
Yes	0	
No	15	
5.5 Is the project housing-focused? Does the project connect unsheltered individuals and/or families to permanent housing providers? *[Project Application: Q20.4, Q20.6]*	Threshold ☐ met ☐ unmet	
Street Outreach Performance (All applicants seeking Street Outreach funding must provide Performance Data for a Street Outreach Project for the period 1/1/2017 through 8/31/2017 from the HMIS or a comparable database report.)		
5.7 Percentage of exits to permanent housing (# of exits to permanent housing ÷ total # of persons served) *[Project Application: Q21 Project Outputs and Project Impact Table]*		
40%+	15	

2017 Orange ESG Application Scorecard

			Possible Score	Project Score
		30-39%	5	
		Below 35%	0	
5.8	Is the project budget reasonable for the number of people targeted in the operating year? *[Project Budget Spreadsheet]*			
		Yes	5	
		No	0	

Emergency Shelter			**Possible Score**	**Project Score**
Emergency Shelter Project Description				
5.10	Does the project serve priority subpopulation(s)? *[Project Application: Q22.1]*		Yes=5 No=0	
5.11	Does the project description describe a low barrier emergency shelter environment, catering to individuals and/or families with the highest needs in the community and an ability to connect clients to permanent housing? *[Project Application: Q22.3, Q22.5, Q23.1, Q23.2]*		Yes=15 No=0	
Emergency Shelter Program Design and Philosophy				
5.12	Did the agency check any of the boxes in Q23.3 or Q23.4? *[Project Application: Q23.3 – Q23.4]*			
		Yes	0	
		No	15	
5.13	Do the descriptions demonstrate that the project is housing focused? Does the project connect shelter residents to permanent housing? *[Project Application: Q23.5 – Q23.8]*		Threshold ☐ met ☐ unmet	
5.14	Is the project connected to or does the agency provide rapid re-housing and permanent supportive housing programs? *[Project Application: Q23.9 – Q23.10]*		Yes=5 No=0	
Emergency Shelter Project Performance (The ESG CAPER V5 from the HMIS for the period 1/1/2017 through 8/31/2017 will be used to compute Emergency Shelter performance.)				
5.17	Percentage of exits to permanent housing (# of exits to permanent housing ÷ total # of persons served) *[Project Application: Q24 Project Outputs and Project Impact Table]*			
		70%+	10	
		60-69%	7	
		50-59%	4	
		30-49%	1	
		Below 30%	0	
5.17.a	Average Length of Stay in Project *[Project Application: Q24 Project Outputs and Project Impact Table]*			
		90 days or less	5	
		Greater than 90 days	0	
5.18	Is the project budget reasonable for the number of people targeted to be served in the operating year? *[Project Budget Spreadsheet]*			
		Yes	5	

2017 Orange ESG Application Scorecard

			Possible Score	Project Score
		No	0	
5.19	Percentage of Participants who Entered the Project from a Homeless Situation (as reported on the ESG CAPER)			
		50%+	10	
		40-49%	8	
		30-39%	6	
		20-29%	4	
		<20%	0	

Homelessness Prevention			**Possible Score**	**Project Score**
Homelessness Prevention Project Description				
5.20	Does the project serve priority subpopulation(s)? *[Project Application: Q25.1]*		5	
Homelessness Prevention Design and Philosophy				
5.21	Does the project use its homelessness prevention funds exclusively for OCPEH diversion efforts? *[Project Application: Q26.1]*			
		Yes	5	
		No	0	
5.22	Did the agency check any of the boxes in Q26.2 or Q26.3? *[Project Application: Q26.2 – Q26.3]*			
		Yes	0	
		No	15	
5.23	Does the project have dedicated staff whose responsibility is to identify and recruit landlords and encourage them to rent to homeless households served by the program? *[Project Application: Q26.4]*			
		Yes	10	
		No	0	
5.25	Does the project use a progressive approach, where financial assistance is not a standard package and is flexible enough to adjust to households' unique needs? *[Project Application: Q26.8 and Q26.8.1]*		Threshold ☐ met ☐ unmet	
5.26	Is participation in services voluntary? *[Project Application: Q26.11]*		Threshold ☐ met ☐ unmet	
5.27	Does the project agree to participate in OCPEH coordinated entry? *[Project Application: Q26.13]*		Threshold ☐ met ☐ unmet	
Homelessness Prevention Performance (All applicants seeking Homeless Prevention funding must provide Performance Data for a Homeless Prevention project for the period 1/1/2017 through 8/31/2017 from the HMIS or a report from a comparable database.)				
5.29	What is the percentage of exits to permanent housing destinations? (# of exits to permanent housing destinations ÷ total # of persons served) *[Project Application: Q27 Projects Outputs and Project Impact Tables]*			

			Possible Score	Project Score
		At least 80%	15	
		Below 80%	0	
5.30	Is the project budget reasonable for the number of people targeted to be served in the operating year? *[Project Budget Spreadsheet]*			
		Yes	5	
		No	0	
Rapid Re-housing			**Possible Score**	**Project Score**
Rapid Re-housing Project Description				
5.32	Does the project serve a priority subpopulation(s)? *[Project Application: Q28.1]*		5	
Rapid Re-housing Program Design and Philosophy				
5.33	Does the project have an adequate plan to ensure access to unsheltered individuals and/or families? *[Project Application: Q29.2]*			
		Yes	5	
		No	0	
5.34	Is the project low barrier, allowing individuals with the highest vulnerability to access permanent housing through the project? *[Project Application: Q29.3 – Q29.4]*			
		Yes	10	
		No	0	
5.35	Did the agency check any of the boxes in Q29.5 or Q29.6? *[Project Application: Q29.5 – Q29.6]*			
		Yes	0	
		No	15	
5.36	Does the project have dedicated staff whose responsibility is to identify and recruit landlords and encourage them to rent to homeless households served by the program? *[Project Application: Q29.7]*			
		Yes	10	
		No	0	
5.37	Percentage of participants whose Length of Time between Project Entry and Residential Move in Date was less than 30 days. (as reported on the ESG CAPER)			
		50%+	10	
		40-49%	8	
		30-39%	6	
		20-29%	4	
		<20%	0	
5.38	Does the project use a progressive approach, where financial assistance is not a standard package and is flexible enough to adjust to households' unique needs? *[Project Application: Q29.11 and Q29.11.1]*	Threshold ☐ met ☐ unmet		
5.39	Does the project agree to participate in OCPEH coordinated entry? *[Project Application: Q29.15]*	Threshold		

2017 Orange ESG Application Scorecard

		met ☐	unmet ☐
Rapid Re-housing Project Performance (The ESG CAPER V5 from the HMIS for the period 1/1/2017 through 8/31/2017 will be used to compute Rapid Rehousing Project Performance.)			
5.42	What is the percentage of exits to permanent housing destinations? (# of exits to permanent housing destinations ÷ total # of persons served) *[Project Application: Q30 Projects Outputs and Project Impact Tables]*		
	At least 80%	10	
	Below 80%	0	
5.42	What percentage persons entered housing in 30 days or less? *[Project Application: Q30 Projects Outputs and Project Impact Tables]*		
	60% entered housing in 30 days or Less	5	
	40% entered housing in 30 days or Less	3	
	Below 40% entered in 30 days or Less	0	
5.43	Is the project budget reasonable for the number of people targeted to be served in the operating year? *[Project Budget Spreadsheet]*		
	Yes	5	
	No	0	

HMIS		**Possible Score**	**Project Score**
HMIS Project Description			
5.45	Does the project intend to use ESG funding for only Service Provider Agency Staff Costs? *[Project Application: Q31.1]*	Threshold ☐ met ☐ unmet ☐ N/A	
5.46	Does the plan adequately explain how HMIS funds will contribute to the agency's ability to collect, analyze, and report data? *[Project Application: Q31.2]*	Yes=50 Partially=25 No=0	
5.47	Is the HMIS budget reasonable in comparison to the number of people targeted to be served in ESG-funded projects? *[Project Budget Spreadsheet]*		
	Yes	10	
	No	0	

Section VI. Bonus

6.1	Did the Project submit a Self-Evaluation of the Project Application using this Scorecard? Possible Points = 3		
	Yes	3	
	No	0	