

2021 EMERGENCY SOLUTIONS GRANT Project Application Scoring Matrix

Contractor Qualifications (30 Points)

Excellent Response 21-30 points	Medium Response 11-20 points	Inadequate Response 0-10 points
Organization has a minimum of two (2) years of experience providing services under the ESG program component that they are applying for?	Organization has only limited or less than two (2) years of experience providing services under the ESG program component that they are applying for?	No previous history of experience in the ESG program component area that they are applying for; Insufficient detail to gauge capacity of organization to carry out the proposed program.
Agency has experience and access to the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS), or if a victim service provider, a comparable database.	Agency has limited experience and access to the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS), or if a victim service provider, a comparable database.	Very limited or no previous program experience with the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS), or if a victim service provider, a comparable database.
Proposal describes participation of people with lived experience in planning, policy, and decision-making.	Proposal has some information on people with lived experience being involved in planning, policy and decision-making.	Proposal does not provide any information on people with lived experience being involved in planning, policy and decision-making.
RRH Providers only: Proposal describes a Housing First model.	It is unclear or limited information if the proposal is a Housing First model.	Proposal does not provide information do describe a Housing First Model.
Proposal describes active relationship and knowledge of mainstream community partnerships that include health care and housing services	Proposal describes limited active relationship and knowledge of mainstream community partnerships with health care and housing services.	Organization has no connection with active relationship and knowledge of mainstream community partnerships with health care and housing services.

Project Understanding and Approach (25 Points)

Excellent Response 18-25 points	Medium Response 9-17 points	Inadequate Response 0-8 points
The proposal describes a logical connection to most of the HHR 2020 Needs Assessment recommendations.	The proposal describes a logical connection between 1-3 of the HHR 2020 Needs Assessment recommendations.	The proposal does not describe a logical connection the HHR 2020 Needs Assessment recommendations.
Evidence-based best practices service model OR creative solutions including a persuasive rationale for the model proposed.	Program model is described but with only limited justification for its selection.	Program model is not clear. No justification for why that model was chosen.
The proposal is targeting support for unaccompanied youth (ages 18-24 years old),	Target population(s) is not clearly defined.	Very incomplete description of need for the program. The

single adults (ages 25 and older), and families with dependent children (at least one person is age 18 or older) in all five program components. There is sufficient reason to believe the strategies proposed will be effective with this target population.		proposal does not describe a targeted population(s) served.
The proposal provides a logical connection between the service models, assistance proposed and the HUD Continuum of Care System Performance Measures.	Client outcomes are described but have only limited connection to HUD Continuum of Care System Performance Measures. Insufficient connection made between services and client outcomes.	Little or no connection made between service model and HUD Continuum of Care System Performance Measures.

Cost (20 Points)

Excellent Response 14-20 points	Medium Response 7-13 points	Inadequate Response 0-6 points
The budget is logically connected to the proposed number of households to be served, including sufficient detail to determine appropriateness of line-item costs.	There is insufficient information to clearly connect the budget request to the number of household to be served and line item costs.	No connection can be drawn between budget request and number of households to be served, and line-item costs.
Budget provides sufficient information: Administrative costs (list items – maximum of 10% of total budget), Support Services (ie: Staffing) costs (list items/salaries), and Direct Assistance costs (list items)	There is insufficient budget information relating to costs for: Administration; Support Services, and Direct Assistance.	Budget does not have information for costs relating to: Administration; Support Services, and Direct Assistance.
The budget identifies sources of match and is 100% of total budget requested from the 2021 ESG funds.	The budget identifies source(s) of match but is less than 100% of total budget requested from the 2021 ESG funds.	The budget doesn't identify a match.
The budget(s) clearly identifies the ESG program component(s) that the proposal is applying for.	There is insufficient information to clearly identify the budget(s) per each ESG program component(s) that the proposal is applying for.	The budget(s) doesn't identify the ESG program component(s) that the proposal is applying for.

Cultural and Linguistic Competence (25 Points)

Excellent Response 18-25 points	Medium Response 9-17 points	Inadequate Response 0-8 points
Proposal identifies coordination with other programs and agencies that can enhance the capacity to provide cultural and linguistic services to targeted population.	Proposal identifies coordination with other programs and agencies but does not draw the connection between the provision of cultural and linguistic services and coordination and housing solutions for targeted population.	Proposal provides little or no description of coordination with other agencies for both cultural and linguistic services and coordination and housing solutions.
Proposal demonstrates a clear understanding of the cultural context of the targeted population, including, where relevant, issues of racial, ethnic, religious, gender, and sexual orientation.	Proposal identifies some understanding of the cultural context of the targeted population, including, where relevant, issues of racial, ethnic, religious, gender, and sexual orientation.	Proposal does not understand the cultural context of the targeted population, including, where relevant, issues of racial, ethnic, religious, gender, and sexual orientation.
Proposal recognizes the needs of eligible participants with limited English proficiency and demonstrates a capacity to provide services in the language(s) required.	Proposal recognizes the need for serving persons with limited English proficiency but does not have specific strategies for doing so.	Proposal does not acknowledge the need for language assistance and does not have any strategies listed for providing it.
Proposal demonstrates experience and commitment to culturally competent service delivery and includes specific strategies for monitoring and evaluating cultural competence.	Proposal describes some efforts to provide staff with culturally competent skills but does not have a strategy for evaluating those skills. Some description of racial and cultural context of the targeted population.	Proposal describes little or no description or inadequate description of the importance of culturally competent services.
Applicant lists specialties in serving populations or communities, specific to the Ramsey County region and gaps as identified in the Heading Home Ramsey Biannual Needs Assessment .	Applicant describes limited experience in serving populations or communities, specific to the Ramsey County region and gaps as identified in the Heading Home Ramsey Biannual Needs Assessment.	Applicant does not list specialties in serving populations or communities, specific to the Ramsey County region and gaps as identified in the Heading Home Ramsey Biannual Needs Assessment.