#### **SCORING CRITERIA**

CATEGORY	VALUE TO WEIGHTED SCORE
Crime Prevention / Safety / Quality of Life Factors	50%
Budget 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	<ul> <li>Clearly stated problems/factors to be addressed.</li> <li>Plans are well-defined and describe very strong crime prevention, safety, and quality of life objectives.</li> <li>Plans provide for expectation of likely successful achievement.</li> </ul>
5-7 points	<ul> <li>Understandable description of problems/factors to be addressed.</li> <li>Plans adequately describe crime prevention, safety, and quality of life objectives.</li> <li>Plans indicate reasonable expectation that goals are achievable.</li> </ul>
2-4 points	<ul> <li>Poor description of problems/factors to be addressed.</li> <li>Inadequate description as to how project will reduce crime and/or improve quality of life.</li> </ul>
1 point	<ul> <li>No description of problems/factors to be addressed.</li> <li>Unclear plans to provide improvement of crime prevention, safety, and/or quality of life issues.</li> </ul>

## **BUDGET EVALUATION (20%)**

RATING / SCORE	DESCRIPTION
8-10 Points	Very clearly defined budget (items and costs).
	Justification of budget items is explicit.
	<ul> <li>Reasonable request for funding aligns with project goals while in compliance with grant guidelines.</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Ample funding sources and/or contributions, including volunteers, will enable achievement of goals.</li> </ul>
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	Understandable definition of budget items and costs.
Points	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	<ul> <li>Volunteer activities are thoroughly described clearly and briefly.</li> <li>Project clearly shows a <u>high level</u> of ongoing participation and involvement of community.</li> </ul>
5-7 points	<ul> <li>Volunteer activities are moderately described.</li> <li>Project clearly shows a <u>moderate level</u> of ongoing participation and involvement of community.</li> </ul>
2-4 points	<ul> <li>Volunteer activities are mentioned.</li> <li>Project clearly shows <u>limited involvement</u> by community members, to successfully complete the crime prevention and/or improving quality of life project(s).</li> </ul>
1 point	<ul> <li>No volunteer activities are mentioned.</li> <li>Project clearly shows <u>little or no involvement</u> by community members, to successfully complete the crime prevention and/or improving quality of life project(s).</li> </ul>

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

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