ANNUAL TIERED MONITORING ASSESSMENT TOOL

Agency:	The agency's legal name should be displayed here	**FY27**
Program:	The program's full name should be displayed here. No acronyms should be used	

Progressive Discipline

	Score	Notes
Program is on a PIP or CAP *Will cap the category at Corrective Action		Notes are required for all responses
Program has been issued a Letter of Noncompliance within the last 6 months *Will cap the category at Classic		
Program was on PIP or CAP within the past year *Will cap the category at Classic		

Oversight & Administration

		Score	Notes
Document Submittals			
1	Program requires significant support such as requiring multiple prompts and/or correction to submit required document submittals (contract document submittals, quarterly reports, etc.)		
2	Program requires some support such as an initial prompt and/or a correction to submit document submittals		
3	Program submits document submittals timely with little to no need for correction		
Monitoring Bodies - Approved External Entities: DCF, CFBHN, or other accrediting body			
1	No external entity is conducting monitoring or at least one external entity is conducting monitoring indicating substantial areas of concern		
2	At least one external entity is conducting monitoring indicating minimal areas of concern		
3	At least one external entity is conducting monitoring indicating no substantial areas of concern		
Current Year Licensing Violations - If applicable			
1	Site(s) has had any Class 1 violations in the current FY or has been placed on probation		
2	Site(s) has had any Class 2 violations		
3	Site(s) has Class 3 or no violations		
Administration (e.g. writing policies/procedures, personnel, insurance)			
1	Program requires intensive and ongoing support and assistance from JWB in order to meet contractual obligations and program administration		
2	Program is responsive and presents organizational capacity with regard to contractual requirements and program administration with minimal JWB assistance and prompts		
3	Program is responsive and presents organizational capacity with regard to contractual requirements and program administration		
Staff Turnover			
1	High and/or significant staff turnover		
2	Moderate staff turnover		
3	Low staff turnover		

Program

		Score	Notes
Methodology			
1	Program changes were implemented without notification and prior approval and/or program is not being implemented in alignment with the approved methodology		
2	Program changes have been made with notification but without prior approval and/or program is being partially implemented in alignment with the approved methodology		
3	Program is being implemented in alignment with the approved methodology		
Quality of Service Delivery (e.g. participant satisfaction, concerns raised during interviews, participant safety/supervision)			
1	Significant or ongoing concerns about quality of service delivery was noted		
2	Minor concerns about quality of service delivery was noted		
3	No concerns about quality of service delivery was noted		
Nature of Service			
1	Any domestic violence, substance abuse, mental health, residential, and/or program serving populations with developmental or physical disabilities. Programs that conduct field trips and/or programming is provided absent caregiver oversight		
2	Any program where caregiver and children are served together and/or direct services are provided to children with caregiver oversight		
3	Infrastructure such as food distribution, scholarships, call center, utilization management, and administration		
Prior Monitoring Concerns			
1	Significant findings: findings that impacted service delivery, compliance or required corrective action		
2	Minor findings: findings were noted that were easily corrected and did not significantly impact service delivery or compliance		
3	No findings: no findings were noted during program monitoring		
Demonstrated Quality Controls (e.g. satisfaction surveys, peer file reviews, documented processes for supervision)			
1	Program has no, or limited, processes in place for monitoring continuous quality improvement (QI) and/or QI processes fail to positively impact program quality		
2	Program has some processes in place for monitoring continuous quality improvement and/or processes moderately impact program quality		
3	Program has robust processes in place for monitoring for continuous quality improvement that are observable		
Evidence-Based Programming			
1	Not an evidence-based or informed program		
2	Evidence-informed: program that has not been evaluated in a rigorous research study, but does incorporate key features found in effective evidence-based programs		
3	Evidence-based: programs that have been rigorously tested in controlled settings, proven effective, and translated into practical models that are available to community-based organizations.		

Evaluation

		Score	Notes
Data Quality			
1	Pervasive and ongoing data quality issues have been identified		
2	Moderate data quality issues have been identified		
3	No or minimal challenges with data quality		
Data Timeliness			
1	Data entry is routinely late or deadlines for data entry are missed		
2	Data entry is sometimes late		
3	Data entry is being completed on time and in alignment with the approved program data sheet		
Data Entry			
1	Data entry is not being completed		
2	Data entry is partially being completed in alignment with the approved program data sheet		
3	Data entry is being completed in alignment with the approved program data sheet		
Prior Year Targeted Service Levels (assess all targets separately, and answer based off of the lowest %)			
1	Program meets below 60% their targeted service levels		
2	Program meets 61 - 89% of their targeted service levels		
3	Program meets 90 - 100%+ of their targeted service levels or does not have a targeted service levels		
Prior Year Performance Measurement			
1	Program did not meet most targets and/or performance measure		
2	Program did not meet some targets and/or performance measure		
3	Program met all targets and/or performance measures		

Finance

		Score	Notes
Prior Year Reimbursement Timeliness			
1	Less than 75%		
2	Between 75% - 99%		
3	100%		
Prior Year Reimbursement Accuracy			
1	Less than 67%		
2	Between 67% - 92%		
3	Greater than 92%		
Prior Year Audit			
1	Significant Deficiency, Material Weakness, or untimely 2 years		
2	Significant Deficiency, Material Weakness, or untimely 1 year		
3	No findings and timely		
Prior Year Financial Monitoring Visit			
1	Sample findings > 20% &/or other findings indicating noncompliance with contract		
2	Advanced technical assistance (includes inability to submit accurate BA with > 1 feedback return) &/or payback &/or significant other findings (incl. liquidity concerns)		
3	No or very minor findings		
Prior Year Lapse %			
1	More than 10% lapse		
2	6 - 10% lapse		
3	0 - 5% lapse		
Current Year Allocation Amount			
1	JWB's support for this program/service is over $1.5 M		
2	JWB's support for this program/service is between $750 K and $1.5 M		
3	JWB's support for this program/service is below $750 K		

Score by Area

	Total Score
Administrative Score:	0%
Programmatic Score:	0%
Financial Score:	0%

Program & Finance Monitoring Category

	Score	Scoring Rubric
Total Score:	0	Concentrated: 33-58%
Total Possible Score:	0	Classic: 59-83%
Program Monitoring Score:	0%	Complimentary: >=84%
Program Monitoring Category*:	**Concentrated**	

APPROVAL SIGNATURES:

Program Consultant:	
Program Evaluator:	
DPA:	
DPE:	
SMF:	