

FY24 Risk Assessment Instrument (RAI) for Client Services
 (For use with Prevention and Early Intervention (PEI) Contracts)

PART 1A: LEGAL ENTITY INFORMATION

#	RISK FACTOR	DESCRIPTION	RISK LEVEL Bulleted Items = "Or"			POTENTIAL SOURCES
			LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	
1	Organization Type <i>(Administrative)</i>	Identify the organization type as designated.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Governmental Entity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Non-Profit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ For Profit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Secretary of State (SOS Direct) ■ Application Response
			<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
2	Related Party Transactions <i>(Administrative)</i>	Identify potential existence of less than arms-length transactions between the organization and a related party. Relatedness is defined as blood/marriage, adoption, common ownership or control, or parent subsidiary.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ No Identified related party transactions. ■ Non-compensated related party transactions. ■ Organization is a state agency, public university or local government with related party transactions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Organization is a private entity (for profit or non-profit) with Compensated non-recurring transactions (single transaction) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Organization is a private entity (for profit or non-profit) with compensated recurring transactions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ ICSQ (see Related-Party Transactions section); ■ RAQ; ■ Audited Financial Statements (Notes)
			<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	

3	<p>Internal Controls (Administrative)</p>	<p>Identify the organization's operational control weaknesses. If weaknesses are noted and corrective actions by the organization have not been verified, this risk factor must be evaluated on noted weaknesses (e.g. audit results).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Organization submitted an ICSQ or ICC during the last 18 months. The ICSQ did not reveal any questionable activity, practices, processes or omissions. The organization provided all required backup documentation. ■ Organization is state or local government with pending litigations or liabilities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Organization submitted an ICSQ or ICC during the last 18 months. The ICSQ did not reveal any questionable activity, practices, processes or omissions. However, the organization did not provide all required backup documentation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Organization has not submitted an ICSQ or ICC within the last 18 months. ■ The organization's ICSQ reveals issues with accounting system, financial statements, independent audits, single audits, IRS audits, allocations, staying current on obligations, cost centers, segregation of duties, maintaining records, having policies. ■ Organization is a private entity (for profit or non-profit) with pending litigations or liabilities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ ICSQ ■ ICC ■ RAQ
	○ ○ ○					
4	<p>Length of Time Since Last Audit (Financial)</p>	<p>Identify the length of time since an audit (single or independent) was last was performed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Audit conducted within the past 21 months. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Audit was conducted within the past 22-34 months. ■ No audit previously required or conducted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Audit was conducted 35 months ago or more. ■ Audit required but never conducted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Single audit, independent audit ■ RAQ ■ ICSQ ■ CQC
○ ○ ○						

5	Audit Results (Financial)	Results of the most recent single or independent audit or single audit desk review conducted.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Single Audit acceptance letter with no issues noted. ■ Independent auditor offered a unmodified opinion with no issues noted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Single Audit acceptance letter with minor issues noted. ■ Inadequate information regarding status of single audit. ■ Single audit pending (e.g. single audit desk review not available). ■ No audit previously required or conducted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Single Audit notice of funding agency finding. ■ Single Audit rejection letter (audit report does not meet single audit requirements). ■ Notice of organization delinquency. ■ Independent auditor offered a qualified opinion and/or issues noted. ■ Audit required but never conducted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ System of Contract Operations and Reporting (SCOR) ■ Independent Audit ■ Single Audit
			○	○	○	

6	<p>Experience Level & Longevity of Key Management Staff (Administrative)</p>	<p>Consider changes in key management staff within the prior two years, as well as the experience of key management staff with fiscal or programmatic responsibilities for the grant.</p> <p>Key management staff may include individuals with titles such as: Executive Director, President, Comptroller, Chief Financial Officer, Manager, or Program Director.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ At least 2 years (24 months) with fiscal or programmatic components of federal and/or state grant programs. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Less than 2 years (24 months) with fiscal or programmatic components of federal and/or state grant programs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Request for Application (RFA) Documents ■ Grant Files ■ Project Work Plan ■ RAQ ■ Quarterly Reports
		<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>		
7	<p>Experience Level & Longevity of Direct Delivery Staff (Programmatic)</p>	<p>Direct Delivery staff are professional staff serving families directly.</p> <p>Evaluate longevity based on changes in direct delivery staff.</p> <p>Evaluate experience based on the average number of months of experience that Direct Delivery staff have in providing grant services.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ No significant change in Direct Delivery staff over the prior fiscal year, and on average, staff have 60 or more months experience. ■ Direct client services are subawarded 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ No significant change in Direct Delivery staff over the prior fiscal year, and on average, staff have 24-59 months experience. ■ Significant change in Direct Delivery staff, and on average, staff have 60+ months experience. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ No significant change in Direct Delivery staff over the prior fiscal year, and on Direct Delivery staff have less than 24 months experience. ■ Significant change in Direct Delivery staff and on average staff have 59 months or less experience. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ RFA Documents ■ Grant Files ■ Project Work Plan ■ RAQ
		<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>

8	<p align="center">Payment Methodology (Financial)</p>	<p>Identify core payment methodology for this grant.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Fixed Price 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Fee For Service (FFS) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Budget-driven cost reimbursement. ■ Any other payment type. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Grant Agreement ■ System of Contract Operations and Reporting (SCOR)
○ ○ ○						
9	<p align="center">Lapsed Funds (Financial)</p>	<p>Identify organization's budget management abilities by assessing the amount of budgeted funds lapsed during the previous fiscal year.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Not a cost reimbursement grant. ■ Lapsed < 3% of grant budget in prior fiscal year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Lapsed 3% - 10% of grant budget in prior fiscal year. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Lapsed > 10% of grant budget in prior fiscal year. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Billing Documentation ■ Grant Financial Reports ■ Grant Files ■ Budgets
○ ○ ○						
10	<p align="center">Percentage of Services Performed by Subgrantees (Programmatic)</p>	<p>Identify organization's use of subawards for direct service delivery and management services related to the grant during the previous fiscal year.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ No subgrantee involvement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Subawards account for 50% or less of grant work performed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Subawards account for more than 50% of grant work performed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Billing Documentation ■ ICSQ ■ Grant Files ■ Budgets ■ RAQ ■ Subgrantee List
○ ○ ○						

11	Subgrantee Oversight and Controls (Administrative)	Identify organization's use and management of subawards for direct service delivery and management services related to the grant.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ No subgrantee involvement. ■ Established written policy and procedures of internal controls for oversight of subawards. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Pending updates to policies and procedures for internal controls for oversight of subawards. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Insufficient written policy and procedures of internal controls for oversight of subawards. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Grant Files ■ Budgets ■ ICSQ - Policies and procedures for managing subgrantees.
		○	○	○		

PART 1B: GRANT INFORMATION

#	RISK FACTOR	DESCRIPTION	RISK LEVEL Bulleted Items = "Or"			POTENTIAL SOURCES
			LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	
12	History of Fiscal Non-Compliance, Disallowed Costs, Billing Errors and Financial Monitoring Findings (Financial)	During the prior fiscal year, identify instances of non-compliance, disallowances, overpayments, monetary errors, or billing irregularities. Also, include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Fiscal Risk ■ Billing ■ Fiscal Monitoring Findings ■ Corrective Actions ■ Contract Remedies, Sanctions, or Liquidated Damages ■ Contract Breach ■ Missing Deadlines 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Organization has had no issues of non-compliance in the past and submitted bills on a monthly basis. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Minimal, isolated, and non-significant monitoring or performance findings and submitted bills late 1 - 3 times. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Significant Financial Monitoring or Fiscal Findings. ■ Unresolved fiscal risk, corrective actions, or contract breach. ■ Contract remedies imposed. ■ Bills submitted late 4 or more times. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Monitoring Reports ■ Non-compliance letters ■ Billing rejections ■ System of Contract Operations and Reporting (SCOR) Monitoring Module ■ PEIRS Performance Report
			○	○	○	

<p>13</p>	<p>Length of Time Since Last DFPS Grant Monitoring (Administrative)</p>	<p>Identify the length of time since DFPS last conducted fiscal or programmatic monitoring of the grant. Determine number of months based on the date of Final Monitoring Report.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Monitored within the past 12 months. ■ Billing review conducted within the past 12 months. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Never monitored and organization has provided services for more than 12 but Less than 24 months. ■ Monitored within the past 13-24 months. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Never monitored or date of last monitoring is 24 months or more. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ System of Contract Operations and Reporting (SCOR) Monitoring History Submodule ■ HCATS ■ Grant File
○ ○ ○						
<p>14</p>	<p>Quality of Services, as Determined by Oversight and Accountability (Programmatic)</p>	<p>During the prior fiscal year, identify organization's ability to demonstrate and achieve satisfactory service.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Validated Complaints ■ Background Checks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Complete, accurate and timely monthly performance and/or data reporting. ■ Sufficient fundamental knowledge base. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Monthly Performance or Data Reporting submitted late 1 - 3 times and lacking in substance, accuracy or timeliness. ■ Developing knowledge base as demonstrated by questions asked and technical assistance received. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Data or Performance Reporting lacking in substance, accuracy and timeliness. (this can not be in both). ■ Validated complaints, background check issues. ■ Minimal knowledge base as demonstrated by questions asked and technical assistance received. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Monthly performance reports. ■ Technical assistance interactions as reported by program staff.
○ ○ ○						

15	Programmatic Success as Determined by Performance Measures (Programmatic)	During the prior fiscal year, identify organization's ability to demonstrate and achieve satisfactory service levels for output and outcome measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Met or exceeded all output and outcome measures. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Met 75% or More of output and outcome measures. ■ Performance measure requirements waived. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Met Less Than 75% of output and outcome measures. ■ Did not report output or outcome measures (if required). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Programmatic Monitoring ■ Grant Files ■ Performance Measures ■ Report(s) for Prior Fiscal Year
			○	○	○	