

## Safe Communities Program 2022 – Proposal Review Metrics

The Safe Communities Program strives to ensure safety and opportunity for all Greater Miami residents by investing in education and economic mobility; health services to overcome substance dependence; and collective action to improve community safety. All submitted proposals from eligible nonprofits will be reviewed and selected by Foundation staff members based on viability to produce high-quality work, relevance to community, potential impact, operational strength, and alignment with program goals.

The Foundation is sharing the intended proposal review metrics to be transparent about how we will rate the strength of each proposal. Each section uses a scale of 1 to 3, resulting in a maximum rating of 15.

In addition to rating proposals individually, reviewers will also consider each one relative to the overall applicant pool as well as the equity of the portfolio's reach (geography and demographics). While these metrics will not change fundamentally, we may need to adjust them to ensure fairness and equity based on issues we could not anticipate before applying the metrics to this new program in real time.

---

**VIABILITY:** Are the proposed plans likely to produce high-quality work that achieves its goals and reaches the target populations?

*Reflected in Implementation (#4) and Outreach & Engagement (#5) sections.*

1. **Weak:** Low confidence in successful, quality work. The proposed work lacks effective strategies to produce relevant, accessible opportunities for target populations.
2. **Solid:** Some confidence in successful, quality work. The proposed work is clear, and it incorporates some strategies to produce relevant, accessible opportunities for target populations.
3. **Powerful:** High confidence in successful, quality work. The proposed work is well thought out and adapted to serve target populations well through identified strategies that will produce highly relevant, accessible opportunities.

**COMMUNITY:** Is the proposed work designed to serve the Greater Miami community by addressing current local priorities and challenges? And, is the proposed work incorporating the guidance and leadership of local residents most impacted by these challenges in order to develop timely, appropriate solutions?

*Reflected throughout the proposal, particularly in Statement of Need (#3), Outreach & Engagement (#5), and Qualifications & Partnerships (#7).*

1. **Weak:** The proposed goals do not respond to community priorities. Limited evidence of engagement with local residents to guide the proposed approach.
2. **Solid:** The proposed goals are relevant to community priorities. The organization plans to seek out and apply feedback from impacted local residents to inform the approach.
3. **Powerful:** The proposed goals are particularly timely and aligned with community priorities. The organization intentionally seeks out and responds to feedback from impacted local residents and encourages their leadership as part of standard practice.

***Continued on next page.***

**IMPACT:** Is the work guided by appropriately bold goals for progress and outcomes? Will the proposed work create opportunity and progress that serve local residents, particularly those facing inequities?

*Reflected throughout the proposal, particularly in Activities Measures and Outcomes Measures (#4a and #6a), Assessment (#6), and Advancing Equity (#8).*

1. **Weak:** The goals are weak or limited in scope. Limited evidence of how the proposed work will advance equity or achieve progress for the residents served. Low value-add for residents facing inequities.
2. **Solid:** The goals are practical but incremental, focusing on short-term benefits. The proposed work intends to advance equity and will provide some value for residents served, particularly those facing inequities.
3. **Powerful:** The goals are bold yet achievable, focusing on short-term benefits and long-term opportunity. Significant commitment to advancing equity will produce high value-add for local residents facing inequities.

**OPERATIONAL STRENGTH:** Will the proposed work have the financial resources and capacity it needs to succeed? Is the work aligned with the organization's experience, and does the budget plan effectively support the work to maintain or grow impact?

*Reflected in Organization Summary (#2), Qualifications & Partnerships (#7), Financial Narrative (#9), and provided budget materials.*

1. **Weak:** Limited operational strength. Little evidence that the proposed work is financially and operationally viable. The work deviates from organizational experience and capacity, and/or the financial plan is weak.
2. **Solid:** The proposed work aligns with general organization expertise and capacity. Budget materials show the work has at least short-term financial viability for the proposed work. A grant may or may not be meaningful for the work.
3. **Powerful:** Significant operational strength. The proposed work is central to organizational expertise and capacity, and there is a strong plan for financial viability. The proposal is clear about how a grant would be meaningful to the success of the work.

**OVERALL IMPRESSION:** What is your overall impression of the proposed work and its alignment with the Safe Communities Program?

1. **Weak:** Limited opportunity created for local residents. The proposed work is not fully aligned with community priorities or the Safe Communities Program.
2. **Solid:** There is opportunity being created for local residents. The proposed work is aligned with community priorities and the Safe Communities Program.
3. **Powerful:** Significant, unique opportunity created for local residents. The proposed work is well-aligned with community priorities and is demonstrative of Safe Communities Program goals.