

FY27 Application Scoring Rubric

Council Scoring		
	Points	Description
<i>Purpose of Request</i>	<i>Max=2</i>	<p>0 Limited effort, did not describe project/purpose or project falls outside of victim services; unclear</p> <p>1 Indicated project/purpose but limited details or insufficiently clearly linked to victim services</p> <p>2 Brief but detailed response indicating purpose/response of request and clearly linked to victim services</p>
<i>Sustainability</i>	<i>Max=3</i>	<p>0 Response does 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</p> <p>1 Response demonstrates 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 response 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</p> <p>2 Response demonstrates an adequate level of sustainability planning; this score could also be applied if insufficient detail is provided to support the response</p> <p>3 Response demonstrates that program has cut costs, planned for funding declines, and pursued other funding sources; there is a clear plan to sustain services and/or plan to handle significant decreased funding</p>
<i>Advance Strategic Plan</i>	<i>Max=2</i>	<p>0 Insufficient response to question</p> <p>2 Sufficient response to question; program identified one goal/task from the strategic plan with clear, concise examples that tie back to the plan</p>
<i>Underserved Victims of Crime</i>	<i>Max=2</i>	<p>0 Program does not serve any underserved victims of crime per ICDVVA definition; or insufficient response provided</p> <p>1 Program serves underserved victims of crime but provided limited explanation and data to support their response</p> <p>2 Program serves underserved victims of crime and clearly identified the populations whom they serve with strong data to support their response</p>
<i>Demand Exceeds Capacity</i>	<i>Max=2</i>	<p>0 Insufficient response to question</p> <p>1 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</p> <p>2 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.)</p>
<i>Trauma-Informed</i>	<i>Max=2</i>	<p>0 Program does not describe how services are trauma-informed</p> <p>1 Program adequately describes how services are trauma-informed</p> <p>2 Program thoroughly describes how services are trauma-informed</p>
<i>Succession Plan</i>	<i>Max=2</i>	<p>0 Program does not have succession plan; program indicates there is a plan but provides no detail, or indicates a plan is in development</p> <p>1 Program has a succession plan but provides limited detail (i.e., hiring plan to replace ED only)</p> <p>2 Program describes a detailed succession plan that identifies key positions/roles, potential successors, and action plan to prepare successors for those roles</p>
<i>Collaboration</i>	<i>Max=2</i>	<p>0 Insufficient response. Minimal/limited collaboration with other victim service programs or has known collaboration deficiencies</p> <p>1 Solid, secure and demonstrated appropriate collaboration with other programs, no known deficiencies</p> <p>2 Robust, exceptional collaboration with others in the region. Program collaborates with appropriate resources and demonstrates a team player mentality, putting victim services first, no known deficiencies</p>
<i>Fiscal Management</i>	<i>Max=2</i>	
Fundraising		<p>0 Insufficient description of fundraising activities and goals</p> <p>1 Limited fundraising activities and goals or inadequate descriptions provided</p> <p>2 Significant fundraising activities with detailed description of all activities and goals</p>

Grant Budget	Max=16	
Budget for Direct Services	Max=3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 75% or more of ED salary is included in request 1 36-74% of ED salary is included in request 2 Up to 35% of ED salary is included in request 3 None of funding request is for ED salary
Budget Line Item Description	Max=3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 No descriptions provided 1 Insufficient descriptions provided 2 Sufficient descriptions provided 3 Thorough descriptions provided
Admin Request	Max=1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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
Budget Workbook Completion	Max=2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 Sections in workbook are incomplete or contain errors 2 Workbook completed adequately
Staff Scoring		
ICDVVA Project Budget	Max=4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 Total project budget is an increase from FY26 award or CAC agency target 4 Total project budget does not represent an increase from the FY26 award or CAC agency target (either the same as FY26 or a decrease); new applicant
Reliance on ICDVVA Funding	Max=2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 Increased reliance on ICDVVA funding 1 0 - 2% decrease in reliance on ICDVVA funding; new applicant 2 More than 2% decrease in reliance on ICDVVA funding
Agency Need Score	Max=3	
<i>*as identified on the Idaho Crime Victims Services Data Dashboard</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Program is in the bottom third range for need score ranking (35-52) 2 Program is in the middle range for need score ranking (18-34) 3 Program is in the top third range for need score ranking (1-17)
Availability of Services Need Score	Max=2	
<i>*as identified on the Idaho Crime Victims Services Data Dashboard</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 Program is in the bottom third range for demographic need score (35-52) 1 Program is in the middle range for demographic need score (18-34) 2 Program is in the top third range for demographic need score (1-17)

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. ICDVVA staff has complete discretion to decide what is allowable and what is reasonable when reviewing proposed FY27 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 four individuals: a combination of ICDVVA staff members and 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 31 points will not be funded.

Application Score	Funding Multiplier
46-50+	100%
41-45.99	98%
36-40.99	96%
31-35.99	94%
0-30.99	0%