

Chapter Core Services Grants

Maximum points: 100

Common criteria to be used to describe sections which are found to be deficient.

Goals and objectives of the grant category from the RFP:

*To provide assistance to local CACs in developing and improving a coordinated response to child abuse across the state in accordance with the national standards set for both CACs and the Chapters. Assistance involves leading coordinated training and technical assistance delivery to CACs, MDTs, and Developing/Associate, Affiliate, and Satellite CACs in the state and coordinating and delivering statewide projects which support the effectiveness of CACs statewide.*

*\*For a detailed list of eligible types of expenses please review the Eligible Objectives & Activities (please review the detailed list of activities) Note: Expenses that are not eligible include any activities or staff support related to fundraising or lobbying.*

The following is standardized language to be used as much as possible to describe any deficient areas. For any section that receives less than maximum points, please select a general reason from the ones below. Please include additional detailed notes if necessary. This information will provide a basis for the panel discussion. These areas may also serve as decline reasons if jointly determined by the members of the panel.

1. The description of the current CAC response in the state**; the need** to develop/improve the said response; the current technical assistance that the chapter is able to provide to the CACs and the need to support/expand the said assistance.  **(20 points):**

1A was omitted from the needs statement

***1AA -*** *0 points, the needs statement was not present in the available field/ the stated need was out of the scope of the grant type)*

1B did not supply sufficient information

***1BA*** *- 1-5 points, the need was implied somewhere else in the application but not clearly, did not supply data in a narrative or attachment form to support the needs statement; the provided data did not support the statement that there is an unmet need*

***1BB*** *- 6-15 points, the applicant did not make a compelling needs statement or as compelling as other applicants*

***1BC*** *- 16-19 points, it is clear that there is real need that is within the scope of the grant however the statement itself could have been written/articulated better*

***Field 1***

1. The description of the **impact** of the grant project on developing the coordinated response to child abuse in the state and ultimately improve the provision of services among your CACs and in your community. **(10 points):**

2A was omitted from the narrative

***2AA****- 0 points, was not present in the available field/ the stated impact was out of the scope of the grant type*

*2B did not supply sufficient information*

***2BA*** *- 1-5 points, the impact was implied somewhere else in the application but not clearly, the impact is not clearly stated, did not supply data to show the desired impact*

***2BB*** *- 6-9 points, it is clear that the impact of the grant dollars is greatly needed and aligns with the grant scope however the statement itself could have been written/articulated better*

***Field 2***

Program development and sustainability scores 3 to 9 incl. **(40 points):**

1. Detailed description of proposed **project and rationale** - max 5 points

***3AA*** *– 0 points, no description; description out of the scope of the RFP grant type goals*

***3AB*** *– 1-4 points, the proposed project is not on target, lacks focus, not realistic, concerns about readiness, not well defined*

***Field 3***

1. Strategy for **implementation** and explanation of how grant funds will be used to meet the goals of the **5-year Chapter Growth Plan -** max 5 points

***4BA*** *– 0 points, no information provided*

***4BB*** *– 1-4 points, strategy not realistic, not well defined; scarce information for growth plan, goals not well defined*

***Field 4***

1. Detailed and attainable **goals and objectives** directly linked to the objectives of the grant category - max 10 points

***5CA*** *– 0 points, the G/O are outside the scope of the grant type as stated in the RFP*

***5CB*** *- 1-5 points, G/O did not align well with the scope of the grant, there are some elements outside the scope; there is no clear focus in the application, it seems that the effort is to cover across the board the expenses of running a Chapter in general rather than focus on the target areas for which the grant is designed*

***5CC*** *- 6-9 points, G/O are not well written, some redundancies, unclear elements*

***Field 5***

1. Realistic activity and task **timelines** - max 5 points

***6DA*** *- 0-2 points, the application does not convey readiness to jump start the project*

***6DB*** *- 3-4 points, concerns about how realistic the proposed timeline is*

***Field 6***

1. Local **community/organizational/CAC member support** for the proposed project - max 5 points

***7EA*** *– 0 points, no narrative, no existing support*

***7EB*** *- 1-4 points, the narrative does not convey targeted support for the project, the required letters of support are not complete/signed/ missing signatures/do not express support for the specific grant project but only general support for the chapter*

***Field 7***

1. **Measurement for success** - max 5 points

**8FA** – 0 points, no narrative

**8FB** – 1-4 points, no clearly defined measurements, measurements not aligned with the scope of the grant category, not realistic or measurable

***Field 8***

1. **Sustainability** for proposed project, including program and plan to maintain the program if funding decreases or ends beyond the grant period – max 5

**9GA** - 0 points, no narrative, no plan

**9GB** - 1- 4 points, lack of detail about the sustainability, not-diversified organizational budget

***Field 9***

1. Information about the **experience and capability** of the organization and any contractors to be used to implement and manage this project; previous experience managing **Federal grants**, including details on the applicant’s system for fiscal accountability **(5 points)**:

**10A** was omitted from the narrative (0)

**10B** the description failed to convey the ability and experience of the applicant to manage the grant (1-4 points)

***Field 10***

1. Information about the roles and responsibilities of project staff and explain your **organizational structure and operations**. Please include a copy of an organizational chart showing how your organization operates, including who manages the finances **(5 points)**:

**11A** was omitted from the narrative (0 points)

**11B** did not adequately describe the roles and responsibilities of the staff assigned to the project - 1-4 points, no clear assignments and roles, misalignment between the project assignments, the grant scope from the RFP and the budget time allocations)

***Field 11***

1. The **budget (10 points)**:

12A did not match the goals and objectives of proposed project

**12AA** - 0 points, there is no connection to the proposed grant project, the main focus of the budget is outside the grant scope

**12AB -** 1-3 points, there is no distinct focus in the budget, rather it is spread out to cover the overall operations of the organization

12B presents some inconsistencies with the proposed project

**12BA** - 4-9 points, there are a few questionable expenses that are inconsistent with the nature of the project

***Field 12***

13. The **budget narrative (5 points)**:

**13A** did not complete the required fields and tabs in the budget form, did not use the provided budget form (0-2 points)

**13B** no budget detail, descriptions and calculations of line items missing, cost budget calculations were not accurate (3-4 points)

***Field 13***

1. The **budget timeline (5 points)**:

**14A** did not include the required information (0 points)

**14B** was inconsistent with the activity and task timeline proposed in the development plan, unrealistic, incomplete, not in alignment with the project timeline (1-4 points)

***Field 14***

Please be mindful that the final application score needs to be **70 point or higher** in order to get funded.

***Internal Notes***

***What do you need to take into account while scoring?***

***Required information and attachments:***

* Information to be filled online, as seen in the HTML document:
  + Organizational information including pre-award checklist that requests information about your financial processes, audit/financial review, and assessing your readiness to manage the grant (you don’t have to review the checklist at this time since it is not included in the scoring mechanism)
  + Abstract (please read carefully, will be submitted for concurrence)
  + Proposed Project, Goals, Objectives, and Project Timeline (please compare carefully with the activity list and codes, may be requested as part of concurrence or data metrics for DOJ)
  + All fields in which an answer is prompted
* Attachments:
  + Grant Budget Narrative Template (the template that the Chapters need to fill out is posted on the NCA website under the RFP documents)
  + Annual Program Budget
  + Audit/Financial Review including any additional audit correspondence containing recommendation or findings such as management letters, etc. ( if 750k or more in federal funding.) Since the chapters are return grantees and they have been submitting the audits on an ongoing basis (within 9 months of their fiscal year end--first check the end of their fiscal year in SKY and the last submitted audit. If they still have time to submit it within the 9 months grace period after the fiscal year end, make a note to yourself and remind the chapter about it. However do not stop the application for this.)
  + Timeline of Grant Activities (Optional)
  + Letters of Support – Chapter Board of Directors (if non-profit) or Oversight Committee (if government entity) and NCA Accredited Children’s Advocacy Centers within their state, demonstrating the support of the NCA members for the submitted application – in one combined PDF. If they are missing some member signatures, please check with the chapter to make sure that they will be offering inclusion in the grant projects for all accredited, associate and satellite CACs in their state regardless. If more than a third of the member signatures are missing, please give them extra time to collect.
  + Organizational Chart
  + Resumes and Job Descriptions (if they are requesting to cover personnel) – 1 combined PDF

Additional Considerations:

* Lessons learned from last year – since it is not a competitive process, feel free to check their current project and address any concerns, now is the right time.
* Address “out of scope” immediately – if the application does not align with the activity list, please do not hesitate to request the needed changes
* Budget review and scoring – make sure that the accurate template was used. Check the budget for:
  + - Mis-categorization of line items
    - Missing details or just line items for which you need additional clarification
    - Unallowable costs
    - Costs that are not allocable
    - Costs that are not directly related to the grant project
    - Baseline vs variable funding
    - Special attention to:
      * All activities linked to fundraising or lobbying, including staff time, covering products with such elements, job descriptions with such responsibilities, etc.
      * Program Income
      * Supplanting
      * NEW – event planning – each time they request funds to organize an event, make sure that they filled out the event tab. If the info is not detailed or contains early projections, make sure that the chapter is aware that this event is still not approved to be charged to the grant and reflect this in the budget form as a contingency
      * Procurement policy- be on the lookout for line items with the same vendor/product that are broken down, sometimes separated in different categories. Address with the chapter the need for meeting the procurement guidelines and put a contingency on the budget item.
      * Product development- there is a DOJ approval process in place for any media products, videos, curricula that are geared towards training other CACs, not only the recipient staff and MDT. If a chapter is budgeting to develop their OWN training curriculum that is geared towards training CAC staff, charging for it, or make a publication or professionally record a video, please address the issue. The approval process is lengthy and the grant period very short, so the chances of the product concept and execution being approved are very slim. If a chapter is insistent on this, please bring it to the attention of the GM leadership team.

* Grantees with elevated risk score- if you would need to propose a special condition to an award due to an elevated risk score, start thinking about the rationale and document it well in the ongoing risk assessments. Please bring this to the attention of the Grants Management team while you are conducting the reviews.

After entering your scores and notes in SKY, please include all major points to be addressed with the chapter in the **Evaluation** field.

Reaching out to chapters – first make sure that both reviewers (you and Kim H) are done with entering text in the evaluation field. When ready, please reach out to the chapter for any edits in the narrative, re-aligning objectives, missing attachments, inaccuracies, budget revisions. Request resubmission of the docs. We are working on finding a more elegant way of uploading the docs and overwriting the text. However, if we are not successful in doing so this year, we will ask for you to just re-attach the correct documents and replace the new texts in the narrative. WE DO NOT have to keep the full historic/first submitted draft intact since this is not a competitive process and we are helping our chapters to build their application PRIOR to issuing award letters.

As I mentioned on the call, please remember, the scoring sheet is ONLY the tool that we need to apply in order to achieve our goal – making sure that the submitted applications are strong, within the scope, realistic, detailed with well thought out budget.

Don’t get hung up on the concern if you are applying the right score. The score should not be the center of your attention, it is only the mean to document your professional stance.

As we discussed we need to ready to submit all reviewed applications to DOJ at the beginning of December. That means that we need to be ready with the scoring by November 30th.

If you are struggling with the workload in November, please let us know. We can extend the time for final budget changes in the first 2 weeks of December prior to the Holidays and the office closure. Additionally, we can add staff to the review team if needed.

Thank you for the support you are giving to your grantees!

Wishing you a successful grant year,

Irina