

# South Nashville Grants Scoring Rubric

The Community Safety Partnership Fund (CSPF) is committed to supporting nonprofit organizations that are working to promote community safety in South Nashville. The goal of the grant program is to support programs that have been proven to reduce violence and improve community safety in the Antioch-Glencliff area.

To ensure that the CSPF is able to support the most effective programs, the grant review process should be designed to carefully evaluate and score each proposal based on specific criteria. The following proposal outlines a weighting system for the responses that will best achieve the desired goals of the CSPF.

Community Safety Grant Scoring Sheet Please complete a separate Community Safety Grant Scoring Sheet for each of the grant applications you are reviewing.

Note that scoring here is reversed from NIH standard, with 1 lowest and 9 highest.

1. Reviewer Name (First & Last Name) \_\_\_\_\_

Criteria	Percentage	Score (1-9) 1 low 9 high
A. The purpose addresses an important community safety concern	10	
B. The program objectives are clear and aligned with the CSPF's goals	10	
C. The program design is appropriate and evidence-based	9	
D. The roles and responsibilities of partners are clearly defined	7	
E. The benefits to each partner are significant	7	
F. The proposed outcomes are achievable and measurable	7	
H. The timeline is adequate to accomplish the plan	8	
I. The budget is appropriate and equitable	8	
J. The potential impact of the program on community safety is significant	11	
K. The program embodies the principles of community engagement and empowerment and the organization is locally-based and has established ties to the community	13	
J. This organization is likely to have faced economic and/or social barriers to development, as described in barriers to development article in appendix.	10	

The percentages were selected based on the importance of each criteria in achieving the goals of the CSPF. Criteria A and B, which pertain to the relevance and alignment of the proposal with the CSPF's goals, were given the highest weighting of 11% each, as they are essential in determining the potential

success of the program. Similarly, Criteria C and H, which pertain to the appropriateness and feasibility of the program design and timeline, were given a weighting of 10% each. Criteria D-G, which pertain to the partnerships, outcomes, evaluation and dissemination, were given a weighting of 7% each, as they are important but not as crucial as the previous criteria. Criteria I, J, and K, which pertain to the budget, potential impact and community engagement, were given a weighting of 8%, 8% and 14% respectively. As for the criteria L, it pertains to the organization and its local ties to the community, it is essential for the CSPF to support the organizations that are deeply rooted in the community.

#### Calculating answers:

To calculate the total score for a proposal using this rubric, you would need to multiply the score (1-9) for each criteria by the percentage allocated to that criteria. Then add up all the results for each criteria to get the total score for the proposal. For example, if a proposal received a score of 8 for Criteria A, a score of 6 for Criteria B, and a score of 7 for Criteria C, the calculation would be:  $(8 \times 11\%) + (6 \times 11\%) + (7 \times 10\%) + \dots + (x \times \%) = \text{Total Score}$  It's important to note that this score will be a decimal value and in order to have a whole number, you can multiply it by 100. But make sure that this decimal value is not greater than 100, if it is then it means the proposal's scores are not reliable. When it comes to decision making, the total score can be used as a tool to compare and rank the different proposals against each other. Typically, proposals with a higher total score would be given a higher priority for funding or other decisions. However, it's important to keep in mind that the scores should be used in conjunction with other factors such as the overall goals and priorities of the CSPF, community needs, and available resources.

#### NIH Scoring Background

[https://grants.nih.gov/grants/peer/guidelines\\_general/scoring\\_system\\_and\\_procedure.pdf](https://grants.nih.gov/grants/peer/guidelines_general/scoring_system_and_procedure.pdf)

#### Barriers to Development Article

Terrana, Sara. (2017). Minority Founders of Community-Based Organizations in a Neighborhood of Concentrated Disadvantage: Motivations, Barriers, and Strategies. *Human Service Organizations: Management, Leadership & Governance*. 41. 10.1080/23303131.2017.1281856.

#### ABSTRACT

This study examines the significance of organizational founding and leadership by focusing on the minority founders of nine community-based human service organizations in a neighborhood of concentrated disadvantage. It discusses founders' motivations, barriers encountered, and strategies employed in establishing and operating such organizations. The paper draws on both institutional and resource dependence perspectives by paying particular attention to how minority founders seek to establish legitimacy and secure resources, but it also makes an important contribution to these perspectives by noting the distinct challenges and advantages for minority founders operating in a racialized context. Implications for research and practice are discussed.

[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/312515442\\_Minority\\_Founders\\_of\\_Community-Based\\_Organizations\\_in\\_a\\_Neighborhood\\_of\\_Concentrated\\_Disadvantage\\_Motivations\\_Barriers\\_and\\_Strategies](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/312515442_Minority_Founders_of_Community-Based_Organizations_in_a_Neighborhood_of_Concentrated_Disadvantage_Motivations_Barriers_and_Strategies)