

Areas for Improvement

Improving CAC Response to TRAININGS AND PROVISION OF SERVICES TO VICTIMS OF CHILD PORNOGRAPHY

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 support the development, expansion, or enhancement of the full array of CAC services to Victims of Child Pornography (CP) and Human Trafficking (HT).*

*To facilitate the development of written protocols/guidelines, policies and procedures for a coordinated MDT response specific to child pornography and sex trafficking cases.*

*To improve the availability of CAC facilities to law enforcement partners after-hours, such as the FBI and ICAC task forces.*

*To provide emergency support services for victims of child pornography or child pornography and human trafficking, such as clothing, medical care, mental health services, and transportation.*

*To provide temporary housing resources for victims of child pornography or child pornography and human trafficking. This is limited up to the total amount charged by a shelter per night or for a hotel room at or below the federal government nightly per diem rates if it is needed as part of the direct provision of services in the process of returning a victim home to their family or caregiver.*

*To develop CAC competencies in service provision to victims portrayed in sexual abuse images by focusing on one or more of the following trainings:*

* *Specialized FI training for interviewing victims of CP and HT.*
* *Training for identification and screening of victims of CP and HT.*
* *Training for Mental Health clinicians on evidence-based interventions for children depicted in child pornography.*
* *Trainings on MDT response to child pornography cases and the provision of services to the victims.*
* *Training for the MDT on working with adolescent victims in cases of youth- produced sexual image(s).*
* *Training for local community organizations and groups on a coordinated response to CP and HT.*

*All project goals and objects must include a component addressing child pornography.*

*All grantees providing services must report aggregate, non-identifying data that will be used to evaluate the improved outcomes for children.*

*\*Applicants are encouraged to partner with neighboring or multiple CACs, where possible, to maximize the number of MDT professionals trained. However, one CAC will need to serve as lead applicant.*

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 to CP and HT cases** and the need for improvement **(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, well-articulated 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 acute*  *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*

1. The description of the impact this project would have on **improving the provision of services in the 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*

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

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*

1. Strategy for **implementation** - max 5 points

***4BA*** *– 0 points, no strategy*

***4BB*** *– 1-4 points, not realistic, not well defined*

5. 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 CAC rather than focus on*  *the target area for which the grant is designed*

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

*6.* Realistic activity and task **timelines and Partner agency support** for proposed project - 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*

7. Local **community/organizational 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 program*

**8. 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

**9. 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

10. 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)

11. 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)

12. 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

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)

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)