**2018 RISK ASSESSMENT FORM**

**FOR**

**FINANCIAL AND PROGRAM MONITORING**

**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 work, and ensure that proper internal controls are in place.

**Procedure**

Based on an evaluation of the subgrantee’s award application, internal controls and past history with grant awards, 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 or more requires intensive monitoring and follow-up based on a thorough evaluation of the grant project and execution of the approved action plan.
* A score 27-34 of requires evaluating areas that need improvement and improving those areas based on the approved action plan
* A score of 26 or less general identifies that the program is at lower risk for potential waste, mismanagement, non-compliance or fraud.

**Subgrantee Information**

Subgrantee Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Federal ID No: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ DUNS No: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Funding Agency: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ CFDA No: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Grant Program: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Award No: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Award Amount: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Program Contact: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Phone No: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Email Address: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Financial Contact: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Phone No: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Email Address: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Assessment Results**

Project Year: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Total Risk Score: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Risk Level: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ High \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Med \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Low

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

GENERAL HISTORY/DATA SCORE

1. Institution has experience managing Federal grant awards \_\_\_\_\_\_

* Within the past 7 years, has > 5 years of experience 1
* Within the past 7 years, has 3-5 years of experience 2
* Within the past 7 years, has < 3 years of experience 3

2. Number of federal awards managed during prior fiscal year \_\_\_\_\_\_

* More than 20 1
* Between 10 and 20 2
* Less than 10 3

3. Size of current subaward \_\_\_\_\_\_

* Less than $50,000 1
* Between $50,000 and $150,000 2
* More than $150,000 3

4. Single audit opinion on major program compliance \_\_\_\_\_\_

* Unqualified 1
* Qualified 2
* Adverse/Disclaimer 3

5. Significant deficiencies in internal control over compliance \_\_\_\_\_\_

* None 1
* 1 to 2 2
* More than 2 3

6. Findings for non-compliance for Federal awards \_\_\_\_\_\_

* None 1
* 1 to 2 2
* More than 2 3

7. Staff Experience \_\_\_\_\_\_

* All staff are experienced in performing stated activities of award 1
* Majority of staff are experienced in performing stated activities 2
* Fewer than 50% of staff are experienced in performing activities 3

8. Management input/concern \_\_\_\_\_\_

* Small, procedures in writing, no implementation concerns 1
* Moderate, written procedures, implementation issues 2
* High, no formal policies and/or procedures 3

TOTAL GENERAL HISTORY/DATA SCORE \_\_\_\_\_\_

PROGRAM/PROJECT DATA SCORE

1. Experience administering This Project \_\_\_\_\_\_

* 3rd or 4th project year and original program director 1
* 2nd or 3rd project year, not original program director 2
* 1st or 2nd project year and original program director 3
* 1st or 2nd project year, not original program director 4
* High turnover of program director and/or key staff 5

(more than 2 key staff turnovers within 18 months)

2. Project budget concerns, issues or impact \_\_\_\_\_\_

* Little to no impact 1
* Moderate and above impact 2
* High to extremely high impact 3

3. Budget status \_\_\_\_\_\_

* Project is practically on-budget 1
* Project is not on budget; reason(s) justified 2
* Not on budget and reasons have not been satisfactorily justified 3

4. Cost sharing/matching concerns \_\_\_\_\_\_

* Not required or prior experience with no problems 1
* Past experience but with concerns 2
* No history or problematic 3

5. Financial Reporting \_\_\_\_\_\_

* Always timely and accurate 1
* Timely and accurate most of the time 2
* Has not been timely or accurate 3

6. Progress and Performance Measure Reports \_\_\_\_\_\_

* Timely, reporting mostly exceed the requirements 1
* Timely, reporting mostly meets the requirements 2
* Timely, reporting mostly does not meet the requirements 3
* Late, reporting mostly meets the requirements 4
* Late, reporting mostly does not meet requirement or did not submit 5

TOTAL PROGRAM/PROJECT DATA \_\_\_\_\_\_

OTHER FACTORS SCORE

1. Results of prior monitoring or other site visits: \_\_\_\_\_\_

* No significant findings 1
* Some minor findings 2
* Moderate findings 3
* Some significant findings 4
* Numerous significant findings 5

2. Add one for each of the items that are applicable \_\_\_\_\_\_

* Current change in accounting/computer system 1
* No procedures for securing prior approvals 1
* Change in financial management 1
* Major changes in policy or procedures 1
* Complexity of project 1
* Major evaluation requirement 1
* Confidentiality of data 1
* Significant potential for oversight by funding agency 1

TOTAL OTHER FACTORS \_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Risk Level** | **Monitoring Plan Guidelines** |
| **High**(35-59) | **Monitoring Plan:** Grant staff completing the assessment will identify factors that contributed to the high risk score and formally notify the grantee and the grant program director of those factors. The grantee will either be given training in the areas that need improvement or submit an action plan on how they will address those areas. Document review will be conducted quarterly to ensure compliance with all federal, funder and program requirements. Either a desk review and/or a site visit will be conducted within the first 5 months of the project or the first 15 months of a multi-year project. The grantee may be required to submit more frequent progress/ performance/ financial reports until further notice.Grantee shall receive technical assistance upon request. |
| **Medium**(27-34) | **Monitoring Plan:** Staff will identify factors that contributed to the medium risk score and offer training in areas that need improvement. Document reviews will be conducted. The grantee may be required to submit more frequent progress/ performance/ financial reports until further notice.A desk review and/or site visit may be conducted. Grantee shall receive technical assistance upon request. |
| **Low**(15-26) | **Monitoring Plan:** Grant staff will continue to monitor progress/performance/financial reports for accuracy, timeliness, and no significant program changes.A desk review and/or site visit may be conducted. Grantee shall receive technical assistance upon request. |