SCORING CRITERIA

CATEGORY	VALUE TO WEIGHTED SCORE
Crime Prevention / Safety / Quality of Life Factors	**50%**
Budget / Budget Narrative Evaluation	**20%**
Community Involvement	**20%**
Project Viability / Feasibility / Ability to Complete the Project	**10%**
TOTAL VALUE	**100%**

NOTE: The purpose of a grant is to enhance crime prevention, safety, and quality of life issues in the City of Phoenix. Line-Item Vetoes can be applied when at least 2/3 votes of committee members present agree that the item does not meet these criteria.

CRIME PREVENTION / SAFETY / QUALITY OF LIFE FACTORS (50%)

RATING / SCORE	DESCRIPTION
8-10 points	• Clearly stated problems/factors to be addressed. • Plans are well-defined and describe very strong crime prevention, safety, and quality of life objectives. • Plans provide for expectation of likely successful achievement.
5-7 points	• Understandable description of problems/factors to be addressed. • Plans adequately describe crime prevention, safety, and quality of life objectives. • Plans indicate reasonable expectation that goals are achievable.
2-4 points	• Poor description of problems/factors to be addressed. • Inadequate description as to how project will reduce crime and/or improve quality of life.
1 point	• No description of problems/factors to be addressed. • Unclear plans to provide improvement of crime prevention, safety, and/or quality of life issues.

BUDGET / BUDGET NARRATIVE EVALUATION (20%)

RATING / SCORE	DESCRIPTION
8-10 Points	• Very clearly defined budget (items and costs). • Justification of budget items is explicit. • Reasonable request for funding aligns with project goals while in compliance with grant guidelines. • Ample funding sources and/or contributions, including volunteers, will enable achievement of goals.
5-7 points	• Adequate definition of budget items and costs. • Justification budget items is reasonably clear. • Rational expectation that goals are achievable. • Adequate funding sources and/or contributions, including volunteers, will enable achievement of goals it.
2-4 Points	• Understandable definition of budget items and costs. • Justification of budget items is somewhat clear. • Fair expectation that goals are achievable. • Acceptable funding sources and/or contributions, including volunteers, will enable achievement of goals.
1 point	• Budget items and costs are inadequately provided. • Justification of budget items is unclear. • Poor expectation that goals are achievable. • Inadequate funding sources and/or contributions, including volunteers, may not enable achievement of goals.

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT (20%)

RATING/ SCORE	DESCRIPTION
8-10 points	• Volunteer activities are thoroughly described clearly and briefly. • Project clearly shows a **high level** of ongoing participation and involvement of community.
5-7 points	• Volunteer activities are moderately described. • Project clearly shows a **moderate level** of ongoing participation and involvement of community.
2-4 points	• Volunteer activities are mentioned. • Project clearly shows **limited involvement** by community members, to successfully complete the crime prevention and/or improving quality of life project(s).
1 point	• No volunteer activities are mentioned. • Project clearly shows **little or no involvement** by community members, to successfully complete the crime prevention and/or improving quality of life project(s).

PROJECT VIABILITY / FEASIBILITY / ABILITY TO COMPLETE THE PROJECT (10%)

RATING / SCORE	DESCRIPTION
8-10 points	• Thorough description of plans for implementation of project. • Plans are defined so that the organization can measure its progress toward completion. • High level of neighborhood involvement. • Brief description of past successful projects.
5-7 points	• Moderately detailed description of plans for implementation of project. • Plans are moderately defined so the organization can measure its progress toward completion. • Moderate level of neighborhood involvement. • Limited description of past successful projects.
2-4 points	• Poorly described plans for implementation of project. • Plans show crude plans toward monitoring progress toward successful completion of projects. • Modest level of neighborhood involvement. • Minimal description of past successful projects.
1 point	• No description is provided as to plans for implementation of project. • No plans are provided, nor is any other method of monitoring progress expressed. • No level of neighborhood involvement is described. • No description of past successful projects.

Best scores will be achieved by expressing descriptions clearly, using as few words as possible. BE SUCCINCT!