ESG Application Score Sheet

Agency Name:

Requested Amount:

Application Eligibility Screening (Performed by staff prior to committee review)	Staff Check
Application submitted by the deadline	☐
Application complete, with required materials and required acknowledgements as specified in the application	☐
Project is located wholly within Salt Lake County	☐
Eligible project type	☐
Eligible use of funds	☐
Comments:	

Application Scoring Criteria		Advisory Board Score	Weighted Score
Consolidated Plan (weighted at 4)			
Score	*Description*		
0	Not answered, or response does not address the question		
1	Identifies a priority, but does not clearly connect the project to a specific objective, or the connection is vague/generic.		
2	Identifies a priority and an objective, with a reasonable explanation of how the project aligns.		
3	Clearly identifies a priority and specific objective(s), with a strong, project-specific explanation of how the project directly advances it.		
Comments:		3	12
ESG Component Readiness (weighted at 4)			
Score	*Description*		
0	Not answered, or response does not actually answer what is being asked		
1	Vague. No real numbers are given for an existing program (e.g., missing length of stay, outcome rate, or contact count), or a new program has no concrete plan, timeline, or bed/staffing capacity described.		
2	Clear. The specific numbers asked for are provided for an existing program, or a new program describes a clear, specific plan (model, timeline, and capacity).		
3	Clear and well-supported. The numbers are provided and backed up with context (e.g., tied to last year's data or a comparable program), or a new program's plan is supported by comparable outcomes data rather than just an estimate.		
Comments:		3	12
Project Narrative & Target Population (weighted at 4)			
Score	*Description*		
0	Not answered, or the response neither describes the services nor the population being served.		
1	Vague. Services and/or population are described too generally to understand what's actually being funded (e.g., "support services for those in need," with no specifics on what that means or who qualifies).		
2	Clear. Specific services are named, a specific population is named, and the two make sense together (the services are a reasonable fit for that population).		

3	Clear and well-matched. Specific services and population are named, and the response makes clear why the services are designed for that particular population's needs, not just that they're offered to them.		
Comments:		3	12

Only fill in New **OR** Exisiting Program Scores, **NOT BOTH**

If this is a NEW PROGRAM (weighted at 4)			
Score	*Description*		
0	Not answered, or the response doesn't describe the unmet need, how it will be addressed, or its approach to ESG and HMIS compliance.		
1	Vague. States there is a need or that the program is innovative, but doesn't explain what the need actually is, how it will be addressed, or how the program will comply with ESG requirements and HMIS.		
2	Clear. Describes a specific unmet need, a specific way the program will address it, and a general plan for complying with ESG requirements and HMIS.		
3	Clear and well-supported. Describes a specific unmet need, a clear explanation of how the program will address it and what makes the approach innovative, and a specific, credible plan for complying with ESG requirements and HMIS.		
Comments:		0	0

If this is an EXISTING PROGRAM (weighted at 4)			
Score	*Description*		
0	Not answered, or the response doesn't describe the applicant's background, experience, or HMIS experience at all.		
1	Vague. States the applicant has experience but gives little detail on what that experience actually is, including little or no mention of federal funding or HMIS experience.		
2	Clear. Describes specific experience providing ESG-eligible services to individuals experiencing homelessness, along with some experience with federal funding requirements and HMIS.		
3	Clear and well-supported. Describes specific, relevant experience providing ESG-eligible services, clear experience managing federal funding requirements, and clear experience with HMIS, making the applicant's qualifications easy to verify.		
Comments:		3	12

Project Size and Project Size Narrative (weighted at 4)			
Score	*Description*		
0	Not answered, or no number is given and the narrative doesn't explain how many households will be served.		
1	Vague. A number is given, but the narrative doesn't explain how it was calculated or what service it's based on.		
2	Clear. A number is given, and the narrative explains how it was calculated and what type of service it reflects.		
3	Clear and well-supported. A number is given, and the narrative explains how it was calculated using a specific basis, such as prior year data, HMIS, or bed capacity, and ties clearly to the type of service provided.		
Comments:		3	12

Outcomes (weighted at 4)			
Score	*Description*		
0	Not answered, or no measurable outcomes are listed.		
1	Vague. Outcomes are listed but are not measurable, or no target number or percentage is given.		
2	Clear. At least one specific, measurable outcome is listed with a target number or percentage.		
3	Clear and well-supported. Multiple specific, measurable outcomes are listed, each with a target number or percentage, and the targets are realistic given the project size and population described.		
Comments:		3	12

Coordination with CoC (weighted at 3)			
Score	*Description*		
0	Not answered, or does not describe CoC coordination or Coordinated Entry Participation.		
1	Vague. Mentions the CoC or Coordinated Entry, but provides little detail on planned participation.		

2	Clear. Describes how the project will coordinate with the CoC and participate in Coordinated Entry.		
3	Clear and well-supported. Describes specific CoC coordination activities and explains how Coordinated Entry participation will guide referrals and service access.		
Comments:		3	9
Community Coordination (weighted at 2)			
Score	*Description*		
0	Not answered, or does not address similar providers or coordination		
1	Vague. Mentions other providers but provides little detail on coordination or avoiding duplication.		
2	Clear. Identifies agencies serving similar populations and describes coordination to avoid duplicating services.		
3	Clear and well-supported. Identifies relevant agencies, explains specific coordination methods, and shows how services complement existing efforts without duplication.		
Comments:		3	6
Funding (weighted at 4)			
Score	*Description*		
0	Not answered, no other resources listed, or how the requested amount was determined		
1	Vague. Funding amounts or commitments are unclear. Provides little justification for the request.		
2	Clear. Lists committed sources and amounts. Explains the request based on project needs.		
3	Clear and well-supported. Lists committed funding, or states none. Justifies the request using costs and available funding consistent with the budget.		
Comments:		3	12
Budget (weighted at 4)			
Score	*Description*		
0	Budget form is missing or incomplete.		
1	Vague. The Budget Line Desciption and Justification provide little information as to what is being requested and why.		
2	Clear.Budget Line Descriptions itemize reasonable costs. Justifications connect costs to project activities with some explanation of calculations.		
3	Clear and well-supported. Budget Line Descriptions detail reasonable costs and accurate amounts. Justifications explain calculations and link costs to requested categories and project activities.		
Comments:		3	12
Application Completeness (weighted at 1)			
Score	*Description*		
0	Incomplete. Required boxes are blank or application materials are missing.		
1	Complete. All required boxes are filled and application materials are included.		
Comments:		1	1
TOTAL SCORE		**15**	**100**