

Mississippi Community College Board Office of Adult Education

This Risk Assessment will be completed by the OAE for each eligible application submitted.

Pre-Award Risk Assessment Tool

Purpose

To assist the OAE in effectively monitoring potential risk factors associated with grants funded by federal pass- through funds to sub-recipients. The focus is to ensure that grant programs meet the following requirements:

- 1. adhere to the grantor's guidelines and agreements,
- 2. remain within budget,
- 3. are able to carry out the scope of service, and
- 4. ensure that proper internal controls are in place.

Procedure

Based on an evaluation of the grantee's award application, internal controls, and prior history with grant awards, the OAE will rate each category below. Scores will then be totaled to determine if the level of risk is high, medium, or low.

Risk Assessment

The risk score determines the order in which State staff will evaluate the grant program and/or perform a site visit.

- **High Risk** A score of 40 70 requires **intensive follow-up** and improvement based on a thorough evaluation of the grant project and execution of the approved action plan.
- **Medium Risk** A score of 21 39 requires evaluation of areas that **need improvement** and improving those areas based on the approved action plan.
- Low Risk A score of 20 or less generally identifies that the program is at lower risk for potential waste, mismanagement, non-compliance or fraud.

PRE-AWARD RISK ASSESSMENT TOOL

Applicant/Organization Name	
Date	
Risk Assessment Completed by:	
Project Year	
Total Score	

Scoring: The following questions will be awarded a score ranging from 1 to 5. 1-Low Risk / 5 - High Risk

		SCORE
1.	Is the applicant on the Federal or State Debarment List? (If yes, no need to go further)	
	Yes (5)	
	No (1)	
2.	Has the applicant or principals thereof ever been suspended or debarred from receiving state or federal grants or contracts?	
	Yes (5)	
	No (1)	
3.	Has the applicant ever had a government contract, project, or agreement terminated?	
	Yes (5)	
	No (1)	
4.	Does the applicant employ a finance director with at least three years of experience in accounting?	
	Yes (1)	
_	No (5)	
5.	How many years has the organization been in existence?	
	Less than two years (5)	
	2-5 years (4)	
	6-10 years (3) 11-14 years (2)	
	15 years or more (1)	
6.	Other than WIOA Title II, does the applicant have experience managing other federal, state, local or private funds?	
	No prior experience (5)	
	Less than 2 years of experience (4)	
	2 to 5 years (3)	
	6 to 10 years of experience (2)	
	More than 10 years of experience (1)	

7.	Does the applicant have experience administering WIOA Title II funds or other grants	
	that provide funds for services to a comparable target population?	
	Less than 1 year of experience (5)	
	1-2 years of experience (4)	
	3-5 years of experience (3)	
	6-9 years of experience (2)	
	10 years + (1)	
	To years+ (1)	
8.	Number of years that the Program Administrator has been in the position as of the	
	application date?	
	Less than 1 year of experience (5)	
	1-2 years of experience (4)	
	3-5 years of experience (3)	
	6-9 years of experience (2)	
	10 years + (1)	
	,	
9.	Percentage of Full-time Personnel in their positions for 3 or more years.	
	Less than 20% (5)	
	20% but less than 40% (4)	
	40% but less than 60% (3)	
	60% but less than 80% (2)	
	80%-100% (1)	
10.	How many years has it been since the applicant had a formal on-site program review	
	for WIOA Title II funds?	
	Never (5)	
	0-2 years (1)	
	3-4 years (2)	
	5-6 years (3)	
	7 years or more (4)	
11.	What percentage of the overall requested budget does the applicant have on	
	hand based upon the most recent audit report submitted?	
	Less than 20% (5)	
	20% but less than 40% (4)	
	At least 40% but less than 60% (3)	
	At least 60% but less than 80% (2)	
	At least 80%-100% (1)	
12.	Amount of grant award requested for this project.	
	\$800,000 + (5)	
	\$600,000 - \$799,999 (4)	
	\$400,000 - \$599,999 (3)	
	\$150,000 - \$399,999 (2)	
	\$0 - \$149,999 (1)	
	. , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	

_

13.	Single Audit Status.	
	No single audit performed (5) Single audit with both material weakness and significant deficiency findings (4) Single audit with material weakness finding(s) (3) Single audit with significant deficiency finding(s) (2) Single audit with no findings (1)	
14.	Ability to meet expected performance goals. Yes (1) No (5)	