

Explanation of ICDVVA 2021 Application Weighted Scoring Components (for FY22 Awards):

- Each application was read and scored by two staff members and two Council members. (See Award Process below for scoring details). Scores were averaged. The average score for each agency was divided by 2 for final weighting (Maximum score = 50)
- We also scored each subrecipient on various other elements, which were weighted:
 - Administrative performance: Grant managers assigned a letter grade (A-F) in 5 categories. These were then converted to numbers, as in a GPA calculation, and added together. The total was divided by 2.5 for final weighting. (Maximum score = 10). The 5 categories were:
 - Draw request timeliness
 - Draw quality
 - Reporting timeliness
 - Reporting quality
 - General Responsiveness
 - Geographic isolation: Agencies identified as geographically isolated received a 10-point bonus (Maximum score = 10)
 - Percentage of underserved victims served: Agencies who serve underserved populations (Rural, tribes, youth, elder abuse, human trafficking, drunk driving, low income, hispanic/people of color, LEP) received a 10-point bonus (Maximum score = 10)
 - Funding per victim served (efficiency): We took FY20 total funding divided by FY20 total victims served to determine the funding spent per victim. The scoring worked as follows (Maximum score = 5, which was then multiplied by 2 for weighting purposes):
 - A score of 1 = \$1501+ per victim served
 - A score of 2 = \$801-\$1500+ per victim served
 - A score of 3 = \$501-\$800 per victim served
 - A score of 4 = \$251-\$500 + per victim served
 - A score of 5 = \$1-\$250 per victim served
 - Degree of reliance on ICDVVA funding: this was a comparison between FY21 and the grant proposal for FY22. We used the agency budget numbers provided in the FY22 application. We divided the amount requested from ICDVVA by the total agency budget to get the percentage for FY22. We then calculated the same percentage for FY21 using the FY21 application. The FY21 number was subtracted from the FY22 number to find the difference. The scale for scoring worked as follows (Maximum score = 5):
 - A score of 1 = an increase of 10% or more
 - A score of 2 = an increase of 5-9.9%
 - A score of 3 = staying within 5%
 - A score of 4 = a decrease of 5-9.9%

- A score of 5 = a decrease of 10% or more
 - How long the agency has been in existence: Agencies less than 5 years old received a 5-point bonus (Maximum score = 5)
 - Since cuts had to be so drastic, we did not use requested FY22 funding levels as a starting point, but began with FY21’s award numbers. (We didn’t want to penalize agencies who had preemptively reduced their requests because they were aware of the VOCA cuts.)

Application Review/Scoring/Award Determination Process for FY22 Awards:

1. Determine eligibility of applicant
2. Determine application complete/obtain missing items
3. Score applications: ICDVVA ED and Grant manager working in the region of the application scored the app (based on FY21 scoring metric as outlined below, adapted for continuing vs new grants), and 2 Council members from outside the applicant’s region:

FY22 Continuing Grant Application Components 100 Points

● Introduction	35%
○ Mission Statement	Yes/No
○ Purpose of Request	15
○ Goals/Objectives Current	15
○ Goals/Objectives Progress	5
● Services	7%
○ Counties Served	Yes/No
○ Total Victims Served	Yes/No
○ Types of Victims Served/Underserved	7
○ Priority Categories	Yes/No
○ Primary Service Types	Staff
● Collaboration & Community Support	16%
○ Collaboration	8
○ Outreach	8
● Staff & Volunteers	7%
○ Full-time Employees	1
○ Part-Time Employees	1
○ Key Staff	2
○ Turnover	2
○ Volunteers	1
○ Type of Volunteers	0
● Funding & Support	8%
○ Funding Sources	8
○ Org Chart	Yes/No
● Fiscal Management	27%
○ Auditing	1
○ Single Audit Requirement	Yes/No
○ Budget Narrative	21

- Budget Worksheet Yes/No
 - Match Sources 5
 - Budget Worksheet Yes/No
 - Attachment Submissions:
 - Assurances Yes/No
 - 3 letters of support Yes/No
 - Liability Insurance Yes/No
 - Professional Liability Insurance Yes/No
 - Workers Comp Insurance Yes/No
 - SAM Registration Yes/No
 - ED Signature Yes/No
4. Tabulate Scores for raw application scoring (50% of score)
 5. Determine points for weighted total score (using point system outlined on page 1)
 6. Using IDAPA 16.05.04 funding formulas, determine the total amount of each funding stream available to award in each Region compared to the total requests in each region. Since FY22 requests far exceeded available funds, use FY21 award amounts as a base to evaluate from.
 7. Discuss and evaluate awards one Region at a time, using weighted scores as necessary to determine awards to programs in regions where funding requests exceeded available formula funds; if there was excess funding in a funding stream available for other regions it was set aside to use for regions with more requests than available funds.
 8. After all regional award recommendations were made with existing regional funds, excess funds from any region were awarded in regions which had more requests than funds allowed per the formula, with an attempt to take into account any disproportionate impacts of reductions on small programs (which might make them unable to continue)
 9. Council discussion and determination of final awards
 10. Award letters to programs, including historical funding summary and notification about declining VOCA funds and expected further reductions in grant funds in FY23