

## FY26 Application Scoring Rubric

Council Scoring		
	Points	Description
<i>Purpose of Request</i>	<i>Max=2</i>	
		0 Limited effort, did not describe project/purpose or project falls outside of victim services; unclear
		1 Indicated project/purpose but limited details or insufficiently clearly linked to victims services
		2 Brief but detailed response indicating purpose/response of request and clearly linked to victim services
<i>ICDVVA Project Budget</i>	<i>4</i>	
		0 Total project budget is an increase from FY25
		2 Total project budget is decreased by < 5.5% or remains the same
		4 Total project budget is a 5.5%+ decrease from FY25
<i>Reliance on ICDVVA Funding</i>	<i>Max=2</i>	
		0 Increased reliance on ICDVVA funding
		1 0 - 2% decrease in reliance on ICDVVA funding
		2 More than 2% decrease in reliance on ICDVVA funding
<i>Sustainability</i>	<i>Max=3</i>	
		Responses do not demonstrate that the program attempted to adjust for anticipated funding declines, cut expenses, or pursued other funding sources; program does not have a plan to sustain services
		Responses demonstrate that the applicant has not planned well for a funding decline and may be asking for grant funds in lieu of actively fundraising and pursuing other funding streams; the request and responses do not seem to take into account the Council's need to balance the needs of this program with the needs of other funded programs in the state
		1
		Responses demonstrate that program has cut costs, planned for funding declines, and pursued other funding sources, resulting in a reduced funding request which reflects genuine needs of the program which are well supported; the answers reflect an understanding of the decline in available funding and an attempt to make a reasonable/conservative funding request and take into account the Council's need to consider the likely needs of other funded programs in the state
		2
		Responses demonstrate that program has cut costs, planned for funding declines, and pursued other funding sources; program has a clear plan to sustain services and/or plan to handle significant decreased funding
		3
<i>Advance Strategic Plan</i>	<i>Max=3</i>	
		0 Insufficient response to question
		1 Program offered general description of advancing strategic plan. Did not choose one specific goal/task or include measurable goals
		2 Program identified at least one goal/task from the strategic plan. Included some details but remains unclear how they will advance plan
		3 Program identified at least one goal/task from the strategic plan with clear, concise examples that tie back to the plan for each
<i>Underserved Victims of Crime</i>	<i>Max=2</i>	
		0 Program does not serve any underserved victims of crime; or insufficient response provided
		1 Program serves underserved victims of crime but provided limited explanation and data to support their response
		2 Program serves underserved victims of crime and clearly identified the populations they serve with strong data to support their response
<i>Demand Exceeds Capacity</i>	<i>Max=2</i>	
		0 Insufficient response to question
		Demand for services does not exceed program capacity; or demand exceeds capacity and response did not include supporting data or adequately describe demand and capacity constraints
		1
		Detailed response describing program demand for services exceeding current capacity and providing data to support demand (i.e. waiting list length, staff layoffs, fewer group classes, etc)
		2
<i>Trauma-Informed</i>	<i>2</i>	
		0 Program does not describe how services are trauma-informed
		1 Program does not adequately describe how services are trauma-informed
		2 Program thoroughly describes how services are trauma-informed

<i>Succession Plan</i>	<i>Max=2</i>	
		0 Program does not have succession plan; program indicates there is a plan but provides no detail, or indicates a plan is in development
		1 Program has a succession plan but provides limited detail (i.e., hiring plan to replace ED only)
		2 Program describes a detailed succession plan that identifies key positions/roles, potential successors, and action plan to prepare successors for those roles
<i>Collaboration</i>	<i>Max=2</i>	
		0 Insufficient response. Minimal/limited collaboration with other victim service programs or has known collaboration deficiencies
		1 Solid, secure and demonstrated appropriate collaboration with other programs, no known deficiencies
		Robust, exceptional collaboration with others in the region. Program collaborates with appropriate resources and demonstrates a team player mentality, putting victim
		2 services first, no known deficiencies
<i>Fiscal Management</i>	<i>Max=2</i>	
Fundraising		0 Insufficient description of fundraising activities and goals
		1 Limited description of fundraising activities and goals
		2 Significant fundraising activities with detailed description of all activities and goals
<i>Grant Budget</i>	<i>Max=14</i>	
Budget for Direct Services	Max=3	
		0 Less than 65% of funding request is for direct services
		1 66%-80% of funding request is for direct services
		2 81%-99% of funding request is for direct services
		3 100% of funding request is for direct services
Budget for ED Salary	Max=3	
		0 75% or more of funding request is for ED salary
		1 36-74% of funding request is for ED salary
		2 Up to 35% of funding request is for ED salary
		3 None of funding request is for ED salary
Budget Line Item Description	Max=3	
		0 No descriptions provided
		1 Insufficient descriptions provided
		2 Sufficient descriptions provided
		3 Thorough descriptions provided
Admin Request	Max=1	
		0 Program requested up to 5% of their budget for administrative salaries/benefits
		1 Program did not request administrative salaries/benefits
Training Funds	Max=2	
		0 Insufficient justification for requested training
		1 Sufficient justification for requested training
		2 Thorough justification for requested training and any hosted trainings are shared with others; or program did not request training funds
Justification for New and/or Expanded Services	Max=2	
		0 Insufficient justification/supporting data for most line items requested
		1 Sufficient justification/supporting data for most line items requested
		2 Thorough justification/supporting data for all line items requested; or program did not request new/and or expanded services

Staff Scoring	
Agency Need Score	Max=3
*as identified on the Idaho Crime Victims Services Data Dashboard	1 Program is in the bottom third range for need score ranking. 34-50 2 Program is in the middle range for need score ranking. 17-33 3 Program is in the top third range for need score ranking. 1-16
Availability of Services Need Score	Max=2
*as identified on the Idaho Crime Victims Services Data Dashboard	0 Program is in the bottom third range for demographic need score (34-50) 1 Program is in the middle range for demographic need score (17-33) 2 Program is in the top third range for demographic need score (1-16)
Administrative Performance	Max=4
	0 Grade F. Risk Assessment Score 40+ or new applicant 1 Grade D. Risk Assessment Score 30-39 2 Grade C. Risk Assessment Score 20-29 3 Grade B. Risk Assessment Score 10-19 4 Grade A. Risk Assessment Score 0-9
Match	Max=1
	0 Match is not accounted for; or is accounted for but with inadequate and/or unclear sources 1 Match is accounted for with adequate sources; or match is not required
Max Score	50
Bonus Points	
Geographic Isolation	Max=5
	5 Per FVPSA Definition (CMS-Am I Rural)
Underserved Victims of Crime	Max=5
*as identified on the Idaho Crime Victims Services Data Dashboard	5 Program is in the top 10% for underserved populations need score

When all applications have been submitted, ICDVVA staff will review the proposed budgets and will eliminate items that are unallowable or unreasonable. Applicants who are current subrecipients are expected to cut 5.5% from their FY25 grant award unless extraordinary circumstances prevent them from doing so. These circumstances will need to be explained and justified in the application. ICDVVA staff has complete discretion to decide what is allowable, what is reasonable, and what justifies exceptions to the 5.5% cut when reviewing proposed FY26 subrecipient budgets.

Application scores will be used to determine the level of funding an applicant receives. After each application budget has been reviewed and right-sized as described above, a multiplier will be applied to the remaining award total. Each application is scored by 4 individuals: two ICDVVA staff members and two Council members who are not from the applicant's region. The average of these four scores will be considered the applicant's final score. See the chart to the right for the multiplier that will be used at each application score tier. Applications that score below 30 points will not be funded.

Application Score	Funding Multiplier
50+	100%
45-49.99	98%
40-44.99	96%
35-39.99	94%
30-34.99	92%
0-29.99	0%