

Pre-Award Risk-Base Assessment Tool

Purpose. To assist grant staff in effectively monitoring risks associated with grants made with federal pass-through funds to subrecipients. The focus is to insure that grant programs meet the following requirements: adhere to the grantor’s guidelines and agreements, remain within budget, carry out the scope of services, and insure that proper internal controls are in place.

Procedure. Based on an evaluation of the grantee’s award application, internal controls and past history with grant awards, State grant staff shall rate each category below. Scores will then be added to determine if the level of risk is high, medium or low.

Risk Assessment. The risk score determines the order in which staff will evaluate the grant program and/or perform a site visit.

- A score of 35 – 74 requires **intensive follow-up** and improvement based on a thorough evaluation of the grant project and execution of the approved action plan,
- A score of 26 – 34 requires evaluating areas that **need improvement** and improving those areas based on the approved action plan,
- A score of 25 or less generally identifies that the program is at **lower** risk for potential waste, mismanagement, non-compliance or fraud.

Grantee Name:	
Grant Award Number:	
Grant Project Name:	
Grantee’s EIN:	
Grantee’s DUNS number:	
Risk assessment completed by:	
Date assessment completed:	
Project Year: From the date of the signed contract or agreement between the State and the grantee	<input type="checkbox"/> Year 1 (0-12 months) <input type="checkbox"/> Year 2 (13-24 months) <input type="checkbox"/> Year 3 (25-36 months) <input type="checkbox"/> Year 4 (37 months or more)
Total Score/Level: ()	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low

Risk Level	Monitoring Plan Guidelines
High (35 – 74)	<p>Monitoring Plan: Staff completing the assessment will identify factors that contributed to the high risk score. Grant staff will prepare and distribute a report that outlines non-compliance issues and areas that require improvement. The report will be distributed to the grantee, granting agency and program coordinator. The grantee shall respond to the State’s granting agency with a Corrective Action Plan within 15 calendar days. The Grants Office will then provide a schedule of the evaluation process and site visits. The grantee may be required to submit more frequent progress/performance/financial reports until further notice.</p> <p>The grantee shall receive technical assistance upon request.</p>
Medium (26 – 34)	<p>Monitoring Plan: Staff will identify factors that contributed to the medium risk score, prepare and distribute a report that outlines areas of non-compliance and areas that require improvement. The report will be distributed to the grantee, granting agency and program coordinator. The grantee shall respond with a Corrective Action Plan within 15 calendar days. The Grants Office will then provide a schedule of the evaluation process and/or site visits. The evaluation and follow-up may be conducted via desk audit. The grantee may be required to submit more frequent progress/performance/financial reports until further notice.</p> <p>The grantee shall receive technical assistance upon request.</p>
Low (13 – 25)	<p>Monitoring Plan: Grants staff will continue to monitor progress/performance/financial reports for accuracy, timeliness, and no significant program changes.</p> <p>A grant evaluation or site visit may be conducted.</p>

Pre-Award Risk-Base Assessment Tool

GRANTEE DATA	Score
1. Grantee's Organization (Grant Agreement Signatory and/or Parent Organization)	
Within the past 10 years, the grantee agency has > 3 years of experience with grants from the State of Alaska and demonstrates an active interest in the program to the Grant Program Coordinator and Grant Administrator(s)	1
Within the past 10 years, the grantee agency has 1-2 years of experience with the State of Alaska and demonstrates an active interest in the program to the Grant Program Coordinator and Grant Administrator(s)	2
Within the past 10 years, the grantee agency has limited experience with the State of Alaska and demonstrates an active interest in the program to the Grant Program Coordinator and Grant Administrator(s)	3
Within the past 10 years, the grantee agency has limited experience with the State of Alaska and demonstrates no active interest in the program to the Grant Program Coordinator and Grant Administrator(s)	4
Grantee agency hinders the policy and/or requirements of the grant program	5
2. Agency Experience Managing <u>Any Type</u> of Grant Funds	
Over ten years of experience	1
Five to ten years of experience	2
Two to five years of experience	3
Less than two years of experience	4
No past experience	5
3. Agency Experience Administering <u>this Project</u>	
Grantee's 3rd or 4th project year AND original program director	1
Grantee's 2nd or 3rd project year; not original program director	2
Grantee's 1st or 2nd project year AND original program director	3
Grantee's 1st or 2nd project year; not original program director	4
High turnover of program director and/or key staff (more than 2 key staff turnovers within 18 months)	5
4. Program Requirements	
Agency has provided services and met all program objectives specified in the contract's scope of services /agreement for the past 12 months	1
Agency has provided services and met most of the program objectives specified in the contract's scope of services/agreement for the past 12 months	2
Agency has provided services but has failed to meet most of the program objectives specified in the contract's scope of services/agreement for the past 12 months	5
Key staff lacks the experience, necessary knowledge, skills and abilities to perform the job duties.	4
High turnover of key staff (more than 1 key staff turnover within 18 months)	5
5. Single Audit	
Single audit with no findings	1
Single audit with significant deficiency finding(s)	2

Pre-Award Risk-Base Assessment Tool

Single audit with material weakness finding(s)	3
Single audit with both material weaknesses and significant deficiency findings	4
No single audit performed	5
6. Results of Previous Grant Monitoring or Other Site Visits	
None or minor findings; timely corrective action taken	1
Some minor findings; timely corrective action not taken	2
Some moderate findings; timely corrective action taken	3
Moderate to significant findings; timely corrective action not taken	4
Not previously monitored	5
7. Amount of Grant Award for this Project	
Annual Financial Obligation of \$0 – \$29,999.99	0
Annual Financial Obligation of \$30,000.00 – \$39,999.99	1
Annual Financial Obligation of \$40,000 - \$99,999.99	2
Annual Financial Obligation of \$100,000 – \$249,999.99	3
Annual Financial Obligation of \$250,000.00 or more	4
8. Grantee Shall Complete the Grantee Evaluation for Internal Controls Questionnaire	
Grantee Evaluation of Internal Controls questionnaire shows few or no internal control weaknesses	1
Grantee Evaluation of Internal Controls questionnaire shows several internal control weaknesses	6
Grantee Evaluation of Internal Controls questionnaire shows major internal control weaknesses	10
9. Subcontracts (If yes, ask about their monitoring efforts)	
Grantee does not subcontract	1
Grantee has or will have 1 – 2 subcontracts	2
Grantee has or will have 3 – 4 subcontracts	4
Grantee has or will have 5 or more subcontracts	5
PROGRAMMATIC COMPLIANCE	
10. Regular Participation in Required Trainings/Meetings	
Agency director and/or key staff attend all required trainings/meetings	1
Agency director and/or key staff attend most required trainings/meetings	2
Agency director and/or key staff attend some required trainings/meetings	3
Agency director and/or key staff rarely attend required trainings/meetings	4
Agency director and/or key staff do not attend required trainings/meetings	5
11. Communication	
Agency director and/or key staff always respond to State’s requests in a timely manner	1
Agency director and/or key staff usually respond to State’s requests in a timely manner	3
Agency director and/or key staff rarely respond to State’s requests	5

Pre-Award Risk-Base Assessment Tool

12. Progress and Performance Measure Reports (Start of Program through Current)	
Timely submission; reporting mostly exceeds the requirements	1
Timely submission; reporting mostly meets the requirements	2
Timely submission; reporting mostly does not meet the requirements	3
Late submission; reporting mostly meets the requirements	4
Late submission; reporting mostly does not meet the requirements, or did not submit	5
FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT	
13. Financial Reporting	
Financial reporting is always timely and accurate	1
Financial reporting is timely and accurate most of the time	3
Financial reporting has not been timely or accurate	5
14. Budget	
Project is practically on-budget	1
Project is not on budget, and the reason(s) have been justified	3
Project is not on budget and the reasons have not been satisfactorily justified	5

Comments: