

Risk Assessment Tool

Grantee's Name: _____

Contract Number: _____ Award Amount: _____ Fiscal Year End: _____

Risk Category:	Scale:	Score:
Dollar Amount Awarded	1. Up to \$5,000 2. \$5,100 to \$10,000 3. \$11,000 to \$50,000 4. \$51,000 to \$100,000 5. Over \$100,000	
Financial Viability (cash reserves refer to money set aside, outside normal operating budget, to cover unexpected expenses)	1. Three month cash reserve on hand 2. Less than three month reserve but more than 2 months 3. Less than 2 month reserve but more than 1 month 4. One month or less cash reserve on hand 5. No reserve or access to other funds	
Past Performance on Outcomes (from most recent report)	1. Met all 2. Met most (85% or more) 3. Met some (less than 85%) 4. Met none	
Staff Experience	1. All staff are experienced in performing stated activities of grant. 2. Majority of staff are experienced in performing stated activities 3. Fewer than 50% of staff are experienced at performing stated activities	
Staff Qualifications	1. All staff are qualified in performing stated activities of grant. 2. Majority of staff are qualified in performing stated activities 3. Fewer than 50% of staff are qualified at performing stated activities	
Organization Experience	1. Organization has been providing services listed in grant at least five years 2. Organization has provided services similar to those listed in grant for more than 2 years but less than 5 3. Organization has provided same or similar services for less than 2 years	
Staffing Level (1)	1. Currently fully staffed 2. 75% of positions currently filled 3. Less than 75% of positions currently filled	
Staffing Level (2)	1. Staffing level sufficient to provide services in grant. 2. Staffing level insufficient but plans and resources in place to increase level 3. Staffing level insufficient with no plans or resources to increase	
Staff Turnover (formula is [# of empl. Who quit during last quarter divided by the avg. # of employees during last quarter] times 100)	1. Staff turnover rate of 20% or less 2. Staff turnover rate of 21% to 59% 3. Staff turnover rate of 60% or more	

<u>Risk Category:</u>	<u>Scale:</u>	<u>Score:</u>
Past Performance on Site Visit	0. Not applicable 1. In full compliance at last site visit/ or acceptable risk assessment at last visit 2. Substantial compliance at last site visit, correction action taken and concerns addressed 3. Partial compliance but corrective action taken 4. Out of compliance but correction action taken and concerns addressed 5. No corrective action taken for concerns identified at last site visit/ or not acceptable risk assessment	
Public Perception (complaint received by County)	1. No complaints or a few minor complaints received. 2. Repeated minor complaints or moderate complaints received. 3. Repeated moderate complaints or major complaints received.	
Legal or SRS Investigations of Staff	1. No investigations conducted regarding allegations of wrongdoing. 2. One or more investigations conducted but allegations unfounded. 3. One or more investigations conducted and allegations confirmed.	
Responsiveness	1. Calls/request always returned timely 2. Calls/requests returned within 2 days 3. Calls/requests returned within 2 to 5 day 4. Calls/requests returned over a week later	
Timely Submission of Reports	1. Reports always submitted on time 2. Reports submitted within 2 days of deadline 3. Reports submitted within 2 to 5 days of deadline 4. Reports submitted over a week late	
Regular Board of Directors Meetings	1. Board meets at regularly scheduled times 100% of the time 2. Board meets at regularly scheduled times 80% of the time 3. Board cancels more than 50% of meetings	
Board Attendance	1. Board obtains a quorum 100% of the time 2. Board obtains a quorum 80% of the time 3. Board obtains a quorum less than 50% of the time	
Operating System	1. State of the art computer system. 2. Not "state of the art" but sufficient for current needs 3. Computer system several years old and beginning to show signs of being obsolete. 4. Current computer system obsolete or no computer system at all.	
Top Level Management	1. All top level management (Program Director Financial Director, Executive Director, etc.) have been in place for more than year and past work experience in program. 2. Some (less than 50%) of top level management new to the organization but have work experience in same or similar programs. 3. All top level management are new to the organization and have no same or similar work experience	

<u>Risk Category:</u>	<u>Scale:</u>	<u>Score:</u>
Facility Adequacy	1. Facility capable of handling additional needs of grant. 2. Facility needs slight upgrade to meet grant requirements. 3. Facility needs significant upgrade to meet grant requirements.	
Equipment Adequacy	1. Equipment capable of handling additional needs of grant. 2. Equipment needs slight upgrade to meet grant requirements. 3. Equipment needs significant upgrade to meet grant requirements.	
Accreditation/Licensing	1. Organization properly licensed and/or program has been accredited by a recognized source. 2. Organization meets licensing requirements and/or is seeking accreditation by recognized source. 3. Licensing requirement met but not accredited. 4. Not accredited or licensed	
Recent Accreditation/Licensing Site Visits	0. Not applicable 1. Accreditation or licensing site visit within the last two years 2. Accreditation or licensing site visit two to four years ago 3. Accreditation or licensing site visit five or more years ago	
Growth of Organization	1. No or only small rate of growth. 2. Small to moderate growth in programs and services offered. 3. Moderate to high rapid growth in programs and services offered.	
Time Since Last Financial Audit	1. Audit completed by CPA within the last year. Results of audit are available for review. 2. Audit completed by CPA within the last three years. Results of the audit are available for review. 3. No audit, or more than three years since last audit by CPA or organization does not make audit results available for review.	
Time Since Last Program Audit by Another Funder	1. A program audit completed within the last year. Results of audit are available for review. 2. A program audit completed within the last three years. Results of the audit are available for review. 3. No audit or more than three years since last audit or does not make audit results available for review. *Agency Performing the Audit _____	
Other Service Sources	1. More than two organizations capable of performing services of grant (completion) within specified area. 2. Two organizations capable of providing services of grant within specified area. 3. Organization is the only source in the area capable of providing services.	

<u>Risk Category:</u>	<u>Scale:</u>	<u>Score:</u>
Funding Sources	1. Organization relies little on County grants and contracts for funding (less than 25%) 2. County grants and contracts account for 25% to 75% of total funds. 3. Organization relies heavily on County sources for funding (more than 75% of total).	
Total Score:		

Suggested Level of Monitoring Based on Score:

- 25-40 Low Level Internal monitoring by County staff & site visits as needed
- 41-59 Moderate Increased internal monitoring by County staff. Monitoring should include regular site visits, technical assistance and review of performance and financial reports.
- ≥ 60 High Limited Scope audit, intense internal monitoring by County staff.

Other comments or concerns of program or other County staff which may effect the level of monitoring required of a specific grantee:

Note: The ranges listed above should be considered guidelines. If during the negotiation process, it is determined that a higher level of monitoring is required adjustments should be made. Many times program staff have unique insights to the ability of a grantee to meet the performance measures established. This information is key in determining what needs to be done.

Final determination of monitoring to be required of _____:

Basis for the decision: _____

