

**2018 Scorecard for ESG Funds**

This scorecard can be used by North Carolina Balance of State Continuum of Care’s (NC BoS CoC) Regional Funding Process Committees to score applications for Emergency Solutions Grant projects. The CoC prioritizes projects that serve households with severe needs and vulnerabilities, setting them on a course towards permanent housing.   
  
This scorecard has four goals:

* Fund organizations that have the capacity to run effective programs (can manage and administer the program, can operate on a reimbursement basis, have experience serving this population or a similar one).
* Fund projects that reflect the NC BoS CoC’s & HUD’s priorities.
* Incentivize agencies to be good partners (participating in community efforts to end homelessness, on HMIS, helping create infrastructure for their community’s homeless service system to operate effectively throughout the year).
* Ensure that funded projects are being good stewards of NC Emergency Solutions Grant funding and performing to NC BoS CoC standards, including descriptions in written standards.

The Regional Funding Process Committee may ask applicant agencies to provide additional information to determine agency capacity to: implement projects in a timely manner with successful outcomes, demonstrate good outcomes in the annual CAPER, and avoid jeopardizing overall agency stability or future funding for the NC BoS CoC.

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

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reviewer: |  | | |
| Applicant: |  | | |
| Project Name: |  | | |
| Project Type (select all) | Street Outreach  Emergency Shelter  Rapid Re-Housing  Homelessness Prevention  HMIS | | |
| Reviewer Signature: |  | Date: |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **PROJECT QUALITY REQUIREMENTS** |  |
| New projects **must meet all thresholds to be included in the Regional Committee’s final application to the NC Emergency Solutions Grant office.**  The Regional Committee’s Funding Process Committee will use the final score on the scorecard to determine which projects will be included in the final application. Funding Process Committees may include projects with lower scores when comparing different activity types, if the Regional Committee has prioritized a certain activity or subpopulation. | **Maximum Score Possible:**  **SO: 157**  **ES: 177 HP: 147**  **RRH: 177**  **HMIS: 137** |

**Scorecard Instructions:**

Reviewers should use this scorecard to score each agency’s application. If an agency applies for multiple activity types, reviewers can score all activities on the same scorecard.

To use this scorecard, follow the steps below:

1. Complete Sections I – IV once, even if the agency is applying for multiple activity types. These sections apply to the whole agency, not specific programs.
2. Enter the score from Sections I-IV into the table below next to each activity type the agency is applying for.
3. Complete the Activity Section (Section V) for each activity type the agency is applying for.
4. Enter the score for each activity type the agency is applying for into the table below.
5. For each activity type that the agency is applying, add the Section I-IV score and the Activity Section score.

The Regional Committee’s ESG Funding Process Committee should use activity type total scores (Section I-IV + Activity Section) to compare projects of the same activity type.

**Scoring Table**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity Type** | **Sections I-IV Score** | **Activity Section Score** | **Total Score**  **(Section I-IV) + (Activity Section Score)** |
| **Street Outreach** |  |  |  |
| **Emergency Shelter** |  |  |  |
| **Homelessness Prevention** |  |  |  |
| **Rapid Re-housing** |  |  |  |
| **HMIS** |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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: Q4.1]* | Threshold  met  unmet | | |
| **Section II: Organizational Capacity and Stability Section II Score** | | | | |
| Possible Points: 37 | |  | | |
| **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: Q5.2; Financial Policies in Tab L]* | Threshold  met  unmet | | |
| 2.2 | Does the agency have any HUD findings in the last 5 years or ESG Office findings in the last 2 years?  *[Project Application: Q5.3; ESG findings provided by agency]* |  | | |
| Yes | 0 | |  |
| No | 10 | |
| 2.3 | If the agency has findings in the last 2 years, did the agency attach an approved Corrective Action Plan?  *[Provided by agency]* | Threshold  met  unmet | | |
| 2.4 | Did the agency show positive or equal income versus expenses in the fiscal year?  *[Project Application: Q5.5]* |  | | |
| All 3 years | 7 | |  |
| 2 out 3 years | 4 | |
| 1 out of 3 years | 1 | |
| 0 years | Further review | |
| **Past Awards** | |  | |  |
| 2.5 | Did the agency have a timely expenditure of ESG funds in the 2017 grant year?  *[Spending tier sheet from ESG office]* |  | | |
| 90%+ (Tier 1) | 15 | |  |
| 80-89% (Tier 2) | 5 | |
| Below 80% (Tier 3) | Further review | |
| Not a grantee | NA | |
| 2.6 | Has the agency expensed ESG funds in the timely manner through June 30 of the 2018 grant year?  *[Spending tier sheet from ESG office]* |  | |  |
| Agency is in Tier 1 (40+%) | 15 | |  |
| Agency is in Tier 2 (30-39%) | 5 | |
| Agency is in Tier 3 (29% or below) | 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: Q8.1, 8.1.1, 8.2]* | 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: Q17.1 for Street Outreach; Q21.1 for emergency shelter; Q25.1 for rapid re-housing; Q29.1 for homelessness prevention]* | Threshold  met  unmet | | |
| **Coordinated Assessment** | |  | |  |
| 3.3 | Does the agency agree to fully participate in the CoC’s coordinated assessment process and not take any referrals from sources outside the coordinated entry process as outlined by the Regional Committee?  *[Project Application: Q10.1 ]* | Threshold  met  unmet | | |
| 3.4a | Do all of applicant’s programs (regardless of funding type) participate in the Coordinated Assessment system? Agency staff must attend any coordinated assessment meetings, including regular case conferencing, regularly. Emergency shelters must conduct prevention and diversion screens and VI-SPDATs on residents and refer all people who have received VI-SPDATs to the regional coordinated entry prioritization list.  RRH and PSH projects must only take referrals directly from the coordinated entry prioritization wait list. *[Interview with Regional Committee Coordinated Assessment Lead]* |  | | |
|  | Yes (must meet all requirements listed above for each project type agency runs) | 20 |  | |
|  | No | 0 |
| **Written Standards** | |  | |  |
| 3.5 | Does the agency affirm that it will run its programs in adherence to the NC BoS CoC’s written standards and participate in any program oversight process the CoC designs? *[Project Application: Q11.1 ]* | 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 (HMIS for all agencies except DV service providers) that allows the user to enter the information?  *[Project Application: Q13.2]* |  | | |
| Yes | 5 | |  |
| No | Further Review | |
| 4.2 | 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: Q13.2]* |  | | |
| Yes | 5 | |  |
| No | 0 | |
| **HMIS (For non-DV and non- victims service providers only)** | | | | |
| 4.3 | Does the agency have an HMIS Agency Administrator to enter data, pull reports, and attend user meetings?  *[Project Application: Q14.1]* | Threshold  met  unmet  N/A | | |
| **Domestic Violence HMIS Comparable Database (For DV and victims service providers only)** | | | | |
| 4.4 | 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: Q15.2, Q15.2.1 ]* | Threshold  met  unmet  N/A | | |
| **Section V: Activities** | | **Activity Score** | | |
| Reviewers should only fill out the applicable section for the activity for which the applicant applied. Reviewers should complete a separate scorecard for each activity.  Possible Points:  SO: 80 ES: 100 HP: 70 RRH: 100 HMIS: 60 | | SO: | | |
| ES: | | |
| HP | | |
| RRH: | | |
| HMIS: | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Street Outreach** | | **Possible Score** | **Project Score** |
| **Street Outreach Project Description** | |  |  |
| 5.1 | Does the project fill a gap in the community, by serving an underserved population, providing services that are not provided by other agencies, or serving an under-served area? *[Project Application Q16.1, 16.2, 16.5 ]* | 15 |  |
| **Street Outreach Design and Philosophy** | |  |  |
| 5.2 | Does the project description demonstrate the agency will engage unsheltered households with high barriers and connect them to emergency services and permanent housing?  *[Project Application: Q16.5, 18.1, 18.4, 18.5, 18.6 ]* | 15 |  |
| 5.3 | Does the agency screen out participants for any of the reasons in Q18.2?  *[Project Application: Q18.2 AND agency policies and procedures]* |  | |
| Yes | 0 |  |
| No | 10 |
| 5.4 | Does the agency terminate participants for any of the reasons in Q18.3?  *[Project Application: Q18.3 AND agency policies and procedures]* |  | |
| Yes | 0 |  |
| No | 10 |
| 5.5 | Is the project housing-focused? Does the project connect unsheltered individuals and/or families to permanent housing providers in the Regional Committee?  *[Project Application: Q18.4, 18.6]* |  | |
| Yes | 10 |  |
| No | 0 |
| **Street Outreach Performance (Only applicants who had Program Year 2017 funding for Street Outreach)** | |  |  |
| 5.6 | Percentage of exits to permanent housing  (# of exits to permanent housing ÷ total # of persons served)  *[Metrics sheet of QPR in Tab C]* |  | |
| 40%+ | 15 |  |
| 30-39% | 5 |
| Below 35% | 0 |
| 5.7 | Does the project budget seem reasonable for the number of people targeted in the operating year?  *[Project Budget Spreadsheet; Project Application Q19.2]* |  | |
| Yes | 5 |  |
| No | 0 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Emergency Shelter** | | **Possible Score** | | **Project Score** |
| **Emergency Shelter Project Description** | |  | |  |
| 5.8 | Does the shelter operate 24 hours a day, 7 days a week? *[Project application: Q20.5 ]* |  | |  |
| Yes | 10 | |  |
| No | 0 | |  |
| **Emergency Shelter Program Design and Philosophy: Low Barriers** | |  | |  |
| 5.9 | Does the agency screen out participants for any of the reasons in Q22.3?  *[Project Application: Q22.3 AND agency policies and procedures]* |  | | |
| Yes | 0 | |  |
| No | 10 | |
| 5.10 | Does the project terminate or exit participants for any of the reasons in Q22.4? *[Project Application: Q22.4 AND agency policies and procedures]* |  | | |
| Yes | 0 | |  |
| No | 10 | |
| 5.11 | Does the shelter have strict time limits on the total amount of time someone may stay in the shelter? *[Q22.1, 22.2; Agency policies and procedures]* |  | | |
| Yes | 0 | |  |
| No | 10 | |
| 5.12 | Does the shelter ban people for reasons other than egregious threats to safety? *[Q22.1, 22.2;* *Agency policies and procedures]* |  | | |
| Yes | 0 | |  |
| No | 10 | |
| **Emergency Shelter Program Design and Philosophy: Housing First** | | | | |
| 5.13 | Is the project housing-focused? Does the project actively connect shelter residents to permanent housing by focusing all services toward helping participants find permanent housing options?  *[Project Application: Q22.5, 22.6, 22.6.1, 22.7, 22.7.1, 22.8, 22.8.1]* |  | | |
| Yes | 10 |  | |
| No | 0 |
| 5.14 | Are services voluntary?  *[Agency policies and procedures]* |  | | |
| Yes | 10 | |  |
| No | 0 | |
| 5.15 | Do residents have to meet any pre-requisites before the shelter will assist with connecting them to permanent housing? *[Agency policies and procedures]* |  | | |
| Yes | 0 | |  |
| No | 5 | |
| 5.16 | Is the project connected to or does the agency provide rapid re-housing and permanent supportive housing programs?  *[Project Application: Q22.9, 22.10]* | 5 | |  |
| **Emergency Shelter Project Performance (Only applicants who had Program Year 2017 funding for Emergency Shelter)** | |  | |  |
| 5.17 | Percentage of exits to permanent housing  (# of exits to permanent housing ÷ total # of persons served)  *[Metrics sheet of QPR in Tab C]* |  | | |
| 70%+ | 15 | |  |
| 50-69% | 5 | |
| Below 50% | 0 | |
| 5.18 | Does the project budget seem reasonable for the number of people targeted in the operating year?  *[Project Budget Spreadsheet; Project Application Q 23.2]* |  | | |
| Yes | 5 | |  |
| No | 0 | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Homelessness Prevention** | | **Possible Score** | | **Project Score** |
| **Homelessness Prevention Design and Philosophy** | |  | |  |
| 5.19 | Does the project use its homelessness prevention funds exclusively to prevent returns to homelessness among former clients of rapid re-housing or permanent supportive housing programs? *[Project application Q28.4; Interview with applicant]* |  | | |
| Yes | 5 | |  |
| No | Further review | |
| 5.20 | Does the agency screen out participants for any of the reasons in Q26.2?  *[Project Application: Q30.2; Agency policies and procedures]* |  | | |
| Yes | 0 | |  |
| No | 10 | |
| 5.21 | Does the agency terminate participants for any of the reasons in Q26.3?  *[Project Application: Q30.3; Agency policies and procedures]* |  | | |
| Yes | 0 |  | |
| No | 10 |
| 5.25 | 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: Q30.4]* |  | | |
| Yes | 10 | |  |
| No | 0 | |
| 5.23 | 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: Q30.8, 30.8.1]* |  | | |
| Yes | 10 |  | |
| No | 0 |
| 5.24 | Is participation in services voluntary? *[Project Application: Q30.11 ]* |  | | |
| Yes | 10 |  | |
| No | 0 |
| 5.25 | Does the project participate in the Regional Committee’s coordinated assessment system?  *[Project Application: Q30.13]* | Threshold  met  unmet | | |
| **Homelessness Prevention Performance (Only applicants who had Program Year 2017 funding for Homelessness Prevention)** | |  | |  |
| 5.26 | What is the percentage of exits to permanent housing destinations?  (# of exits to permanent housing destinations ÷ total # of persons served) *[Metrics sheet of QPR in Tab C]* |  | | |
| At least 80% | 10 | |  |
| Below 80% | 0 | |
| 5.27 | Does the project budget seem reasonable for the number of people targeted in the operating year?  *[Project Budget Spreadsheet; Project Application Q31.2]* |  | | |
| Yes | 5 | |  |
| No | 0 | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rapid Re-Housing** | | **Possible Score** | | **Project Score** |
| **Rapid Re-Housing Project Description** | |  | |  |
| 5.28 | Does the agency provide assistance for paying security deposits, last month’s rent, utility deposits, utility payments, moving costs, housing search, housing stability case management, mediation, rental assistance and arrears? *[Project Application: Q24.2]* |  | |  |
| Yes (agency must provide at least all of the above list of services) | 5 | |  |
| No | 0 | |
| **Rapid Re-Housing Program Design and Philosophy** | |  | |  |
| 5.29 | Does the project have an adequate plan to ensure access to unsheltered individuals and/or families? *[Project Application: Q26.2]* |  | | |
| Yes | 5 |  | |
| No | 0 |
| 5.30 | Is the project low barrier, meaning the project assumes all participants are ready for housing and does not require participants to meet pre-requisites, other than HUD-mandated eligibility, before entering the program? *[Project Application: Q26.3, 26.4; Agency policies and procedures]* |  | | |
| Yes | 10 | |  |
| No | 0 | |
| 5.31 | Does the agency screen out participants for any of the reasons in Q26.5?  *[Project Application: Q26.5; Agency policies and procedures]* |  | | |
| Yes | 0 | |  |
| No | 10 | |
| 5.32 | Does the agency terminate participants for any of the reasons in Q26.6? *[Project Application: Q26.6; Agency policies and procedures]* |  | | |
| Yes | 0 |  | |
| No | 10 |
| 5.33 | 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: Q26.7]* |  | | |
| Yes | 10 | |  |
| No | 0 | |
| 5.34 | Does the project provide active and assertive support to help participants find housing, including calling landlords on their behalf, visiting properties with clients, and negotiating with landlords? *[Project Application: 26.8.1, 26.9.1; Agency policies and procedures]* |  | | |
| Yes | 10 |  | |
| No | 0 |
| 5.35 | Is participation in services voluntary? *[Project Application: Q26.13.1]* |  |  | |
| Yes | 10 |  | |
| No | 0 |
| 5.36 | 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 26.11]* |  | | |
| Yes | 10 |  | |
| No | 0 |
| 5.37 | Does the project take all referrals from the Regional Committee’s coordinated assessment prioritization wait list?  *[Project Application: Q26.15; Interview with Coordinated Assessment Lead]* | Threshold  met  unmet | | |
| **Rapid Re-Housing Project Performance (Only applicants who had Program Year 2017 funding for Rapid Re-Housing)** | |  | | |
| 5.38 | What is the percentage of exits to permanent housing destinations?  (# of exits to permanent housing destinations ÷ total # of persons served) *[Metrics sheet of QPR in Tab C]* |  | | |
| At least 80% | 15 | |  |
| Below 80% | 0 | |
| 5.39 | Does the project budget seem reasonable for the number of people targeted in the operating year?  *[Project Budget Spreadsheet; Project Application Q 27.2]* |  | | |
| Yes | 5 | |  |
| No | 0 | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **HMIS** | | **Possible Score** | **Project Score** |
| **HMIS Project Description** | |  |  |
| 5.41 | Does the plan adequately explain how HMIS funds will contribute to the agency’s ability to collect, analyze, and report data?  *[Project Application: Q32.3]* | 50 |  |
| 5.42 | Does the HMIS budget seems reasonable in comparison to the number of people targeted in ESG-funded projects?  *[Project Budget Spreadsheet; Project Application: Q19.2 for street outreach, Q23.2 for emergency shelter, Q31.2 for homelessness prevention, Q27.2 for rapid re-housing]* |  | |
| Yes | 10 |  |
| No | 0 |