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	 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 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	Adequate definition of budget items and costs.
points	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	 Volunteer activities are thoroughly described clearly and briefly. Project clearly shows a <u>high level</u> of ongoing participation and involvement of community.
5-7 points	 Volunteer activities are moderately described. Project clearly shows a <u>moderate level</u> of ongoing participation and involvement of community.
2-4 points	 Volunteer activities are mentioned. Project clearly shows <u>limited involvement</u> 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 <u>little or no involvement</u> 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!