Introductions

• Who are you?
• What agency/school are you from?
• What is your role?
• What IDHS Grant(s) have you worked with or plan to apply for?
Purposes

By the end of this seminar, participants should be able to:

• Describe the competitive grants process
• Discuss reasons why IDHS grants are becoming more competitive
• Apply the grant writing techniques described in the sessions to an IDHS grant proposal
• Write a strong proposal eligible for funding
• Incorporate best practices into an IDHS grant proposal
Agenda

• Funding Overview
• Grant Writing Techniques
  – Competitive Nature
  – Defining the Need
  – Gap Analysis/Logic Model
  – Strategic Writing
  – Objectives and Performance Measures
• Match
• 2014 Grant Proposal changes
Funding Overview
Homeland Security Grant (HSGP)

- The Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) is comprised of three interconnected grant programs:
  - State Homeland Security Program (SHSP)
    - Supports the implementation of State Homeland Security Strategies to address the identified planning, organization, equipment, training, and exercise needs to prevent, protect against, mitigate, respond to, and recover from acts of terrorism and other catastrophic events.
  - Urban Areas Security Initiative (UASI)
    - Addresses the unique planning, organization, equipment, training, and exercise needs of high-threat, high-density Urban Areas, and assists them in building an enhanced and sustainable capacity to prevent, protect against, mitigate, respond to, and recover from acts of terrorism.
  - Operations Stonegarden (OPSG)
    - Supports enhanced cooperation and coordination among local, tribal, territorial, State, and Federal law enforcement agencies in a joint mission to secure the United States’ borders along routes of ingress from international borders to include travel corridors in States bordering Mexico and Canada, as well as States and territories with international water borders.

- States must meet the 80% pass-through requirement within 45 days of the award date.
Status of Funding

Homeland Security Grant Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$22,590,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$20,128,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$19,122,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$18,431,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$5,663,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$4,051,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$3,459,364</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Emergency Management Performance Grant (EMPG)

- EMPG provides funding to States to assist in preparing for all hazards, as authorized by the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.)
- Supports all core capabilities in the prevention, protection, mitigation, response and recovery mission areas based on allowable costs
- In Indiana:
  - Local Emergency Management personnel salary reimbursement
  - EMA Competitive grant program
  - EOC Sustainment
  - Emergency Management Training Program
  - Agency Staff Support (salaries, travel, training, etc.)
Status of Funding

Emergency Management Performance Grant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$3,896,491</td>
<td>$5,808,552</td>
<td>$6,100,540</td>
<td>$6,562,747</td>
<td>$6,529,870</td>
<td>$6,749,053</td>
<td>$6,592,684</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hazardous Materials Emergency Preparedness (HMEP) Grant Program

- HMEP increases ability to safety and efficiently handle hazardous materials accidents and incidents, enhance implementation of the Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act of 1986 and encourage a comprehensive approach to emergency training and planning by incorporating the unique challenges of responses to transportation situations.
- Planning and Training funding only for transportation based incidents.
  - Planning:
    - Developing, improving and implementing emergency plans under Title III;
    - Conducting commodity flow studies; and
    - Determining the need for regional hazardous material response.
  - Training
    - Training of public sector employees to respond safety and efficiently to accidents and incidents involving the transportation of hazardous materials.
Status of Funding

Hazardous Materials Emergency Preparedness (HMEP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>$302,308</td>
<td>$512,532</td>
<td>$512,532</td>
<td>$512,532</td>
<td>$537,270</td>
<td>$536,745</td>
<td>$536,745</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indiana Department of Homeland Security
Homeland Security Foundation

• Purchase of Secure Indiana license plate proceeds go directly to the Foundation
• Funds equipment grants ($4,000 maximum) and scholarships ($2,000 maximum)
• Foundation Committee members appointed by Governor and based on Congressional District
• For FY 2014, the budget is $454,598.52
Secured School Safety Grant Program

- IC 10-21-1 defines the Secured School Safety Grant Program
- $20 million in non-reverting funds allotted in the last biennial budget
- Future funding unknown at this time, dependent upon state legislature
- Automatic 3% reversion; additional 1.5% reversion taken in December 2013
- FY2014 (first grant year) $9,097,702 awarded
Grant Writing
Grant Writing

• The majority of grant writing work happens before the proposal is written.
• Plan with the end in mind
  – When the grant cycle is completed how will your agency/community/school be more secure?
  – How will you be able to tell?
• Written information should be clear, concise, and directed toward achieving desired end state.
Competitive Grants

- For 2013, IDHS instituted a competitive grant process for locals when applying for three major grants:
  - Secured School Safety Grant Fund (Board awarded)
  - Homeland Security Foundation (Sub-committee reviewed/Board awarded)
  - Homeland Security Grant Program (Sub-committee reviewed/IDHS Executive Director awarded)
Competitive Grants

• Due to decreased funds, grants at the federal and state level have become much more competitive to ensure the funding is being utilized to its maximum potential.
• Competition necessitated by scarcity of funds
  - Not a popularity contest
  - Results driven
• By scoring proposals, applicants must “make their case” for their project, rather than it being funding because it is needed. There must me more effort in today’s grant realities.
Defining Need

• Justifies the need for the project(s)
• Should be based on data
• Should be consistent with the defined priorities of the grant(s)
Needs Analysis -- Schools

• What school safety data do you have?
• What does the data tell you?
  – Are there gaps or security needs that are evident in looking at the data?
• Do any of those gaps or security needs mesh with the purposes of the grant?
Gap Analysis – Other Grants

- Identify the hazard
- Identify desired capabilities
- Identify the risk
- Identify the capacity
Identify the Hazard

A Hazard is a potential source of harm or adverse health effect on a person or persons’

- Hazard and Vulnerability Assessments
- Risk Assessments
- Threat Assessments
- Critical Infrastructure Lists
- Intelligence Assessments and Estimates
- Recent Incidents
Hazard Examples

- Pandemic
- Terrorism – Bombing
- Pipeline Explosion
- Haz-Mat Accidents
- Earthquake
- Tornado
- Active Shooter
Identify Desired Capabilities

- Strategic Plans
- Indiana Strategy for Homeland Security
- National Preparedness Guidelines
- Target Capabilities List
- National Incident Management System
- Elected and Appointed Officials Defined Priorities
Sample Desired Capabilities

- Regional Collaboration & Planning (State Strategy, NPG & TCL)
- CBRNE & Haz-Mat Response (NPG & TCL)
- EOC Management & Operations (NIMS & TCL)
- Incident Management (NIMS & TCL)
- Interoperable Communications (NPG, NIMS & TCL)
- EOD Response (State Strategy, NPG & TCL)
Identify Risk

Risk is the **likelihood** that a person may be harmed if exposed to a hazard.

- Threat (Probability)
- Vulnerability (Susceptibility)
- Consequence (Damage)
- Risk is a function of T+V+C

\[
\text{RISK} = \text{THREAT} + \text{VULNERABILITY} + \text{CONSEQUENCE}
\]
Identify Risk

1 = No Risk  5 = High Risk

• Regional Collaboration & Planning (4)
• CBRNE & Haz-Mat Response (2)
• EOC Management & Ops (4)
• Incident Management (5)
• Interoperable Communications (4)
• EOD Response (1)
Identify Capacity

1 = No Capacity    5 = High Capacity

- Regional Collaboration & Planning (2)
- CBRNE & Haz-Mat Response (4)
- EOC Management & Ops (2)
- Incident Management (1)
- Interoperable Communications (3)
- EOD Response (1)
Reference Materials

• National Preparedness Guidelines
  – Expand Regional Collaboration
  – Implement NIMS & NRF
  – Implement NIPP
  – Strengthen Information Sharing and Collaboration Capabilities
  – Strengthen Interoperable and Operable Communications Capabilities
  – Strengthen CBRNE Detection, Response and Decon Capabilities
  – Strengthen Medical Surge and Mass Prophylaxis Capabilities
  – Community Preparedness: Strengthening Planning and Citizen Capabilities

Reference Materials

• National Incident Management System (NIMS)
  – Preparedness
  – Communications and Information Management
  – Resource Management
  – Command and Management
  – On-going Management and Maintenance

• http://www.fema.gov/emergency/nims/
• http://www.fema.gov/pdf/emergency/nims/NIMS_core.pdf
Best Practice

• Rush County Schools
  – Conducted threat assessment
  – Prioritized needs:
    • Restrict access to school buildings
    • Communicate and coordinate with local EMA and law enforcement

• Rush County EMA
  – Conducted gap/hazard analysis
  – Identified capacity and risk within school corporation
  – Prioritized need to communicate and coordinate with school corporation.
Best Practice

• Rush County Schools
  – Wrote Secured School Safety Grant for cameras compatible with local EMA and law enforcement

• Rush County EMA
  – Wrote HSGP to upgrade EOC and backup EOC (at local law enforcement office)
  – Ensured their upgrades were compatible with new corporation cameras.

• Both grants were funded and the grants are working in concert to increase school security and local capacity efficiently.
Strategic Grant Proposals

• Grants should be written from a strategic standpoint. You should clearly define the “bigger picture” for the funding.
• The pieces of the grant, such as the narratives and descriptions, should all describe the same strategic goal.
• Why is this important to remember?
Objectives and Performance Measures

- Objectives define the desired end state of the grant performance period.

- Performance Measures are the means of measuring progress toward meeting objectives.
Outcomes

- Outcomes are not activities. They are why we perform activities.
- Define outcomes prior to beginning activities.
- Be careful not to confuse activities with outcomes.
Grant Objectives

- What are some objectives that would apply to the grant for which you are applying?
Grant Activities
How do you answer these questions for your grant?

• What activities do we currently provide to support the desired outcome?
• Who participates in these activities?
• How do we support these activities?
• What are some other activities that might help us support the desired outcome?
• Should others participate in the activities?
Outputs

- Outputs are not outcomes
- They are related to performing the activities
Performance Measures

• Can be both quantitative and qualitative
• Tell when, how, and (depending on the outcome) by how much
• If an assessment is not well connected with an outcome it should be reassessed
• We should continually look at measures and outcomes to determine if they need to be adjusted
Measures
A word or two on data

Qualitative Data
- **Standardized** observations
- **Standardized** interviews
- Document analyses

Quantitative Data
- Assessment results
- Evaluation results
- Attendance
- A documented number of occurrences within a specific timeframe.
NOT Data

- Anecdotes
- Activities
- Feelings
- Tradition
Grant Measures

• Remember to keep your measures SMART
  – Specific
  – Measurable
  – Attainable
  – Relevant
  – Time-limited
Defining Match
Match

• EMPG (50%) and HMEP (20%) requires you to find other sources of funding to match or exceed the grant’s matching stipulation
• Secured School Safety requires a 1:1 match for the grant (dollar for dollar)
• Match items must be grant eligible/allowable
• Stipulations usually are expressed as a percentage:
  – For example, a matching grant might cover 50% of the project cost, which means you have to find another source or sources to cover the remaining 50%.
Hard vs. Soft Match

• “Hard match” is actual cash match from your own general operating monies
  – For example, if you want to count a graduate assistant’s salary as hard match in a grant, the graduate assistant’s salary must be budgeted for the time period covered by the grant

• “Soft match” is other expenses that are related to the project, but will not be charged to the project
  – Examples of soft match include: administrative and clerical support and facilities personnel salaries and fringe on a prorated basis; project-related travel not charged to the grant; existing or newly purchased equipment and/or supplies not being charged to the grant; and contracted consultants who will provide expertise to the project but whose expenses aren’t eligible for grant funding.
  – According to the IDHS T&E guidance, the stipend for volunteers is $15.00 per hour for each hour the volunteer is deployed to the exercise that includes the time actually at the training venue.
2014 Grant Proposals
HSGP Proposal

1. Identification Information
   a. Contact information and applicant information

2. New/Ongoing Project
   a. Select which is appropriate

3. Proposal Description and Overview
   a. Drop-down menu, based on
   b. Narrative of the project (2500 characters)
   c. Drop-down menu of sustainment options
   d. Drop-down menu, state or local
   e. Drop-down menu, based on 2013 Draft IDHS Strategy
   f. Drop-down menu, based on USDHS
   g. Drop-down menu, must add narrative
   h. Drop-down menu, primary and secondary
   i. Narrative of the shortfall project will address
   j. Narrative of the challenges anticipated in implementing this project.
## Proposal Scoring (District)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Planning Council Approval</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Is the project supported by the District Planning Council?</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### District Planning Council Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Does the proposal clearly identify the problem the applicant is addressing? (Give more credit for projects that are specific, focused and targeted.)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Does the proposal clearly identify an appropriate solution to the problem(s) identified?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Does this proposal fall in line with established State and National Priorities?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Does this proposal explain how it fits in with the District Priorities and Plan?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project Description Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Objectives and Activities/Methods</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Does the proposal provide specific accomplishments, milestones and reasonable challenges?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Are the project objectives specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and timely (SMART)?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Are key staff and volunteer responsibilities adequately described? Does the staff identified have the capacity to adequately achieve the project’s objectives?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project Objectives and Activities/Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Impact</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Does the project and collective accomplishments address the risk identified?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Does the proposed plan sustain/maintain the capabilities created or enhanced by this project?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project Impact Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Are the budget items reasonable, necessary and allowable, including Authorized Equipment List (AEL) numbers?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Is the budget justification sufficient to explain the necessity of each budget item?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Budget Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous Performance</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. How has this District performed in the previous funding year?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Previous Performance Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Score (Add scores for all shaded rows)</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HSGP County Proposal

1. Proposal Questions will be the same as the regular HSGP proposal template
2. Additional Questions:
   a. Drop-down menu, question regarding the County Strategic Plan
   b. Drop-down menu, question regarding the approval by County Commissioners
   c. Drop-down menu, question regarding support from multiple agencies
3. Attachments:
   a. Upload section to add any additional supporting documents such as the County Strategic Plan, the minutes from the meeting regarding approval by County Commissioners, etc.
# Proposal Scoring (County)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Is the project supported by the County Advisory Council or County Commissioners?</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Approval Score (#1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Does the proposal clearly identify the problem the applicant is addressing? (Give more credit for projects that are specific, focused and targeted.)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Does the proposal clearly identify an appropriate solution to the problem(s) identified?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Does this proposal fall in line with established State and National Priorities?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Does this proposal fit in with the County Strategic Plan?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description Score (add #s 2-4)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Objectives and Activities/Methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Does the proposal provide specific accomplishments, milestones and reasonable challenges?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Are the project objectives specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and timely (SMART)?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Are key staff and volunteer responsibilities adequately described? Does the staff identified have the capacity to adequately achieve the project's objectives?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Objectives and Activities/Methods (add #s 5-7)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Does the proposal identify a sustainment plan or explain why sustainment is not needed?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Does the proposed plan sustain/maintain the capabilities created or enhanced by this project?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Impact Score (add #s 10-12)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Are the budget items reasonable, necessary and allowable, including Authorized Equipment List (AEL) numbers?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Is the budget justification sufficient to explain the necessity of each budget item?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Score (add #s 13-14)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Does this project support more than one agency or entity?</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration Score (15)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score (Add scores for all shaded rows)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EMPG Proposal

1. Identification Information
   a. Contact information and applicant information

2. Proposal Description and Overview
   a. Narrative of the project (2500 characters)
   b. Drop-down menu of EMFs identified
   c. Drop-down menu, based on 2013 Draft IDHS Strategy
   d. Drop-down menu, based on USDHS
   e. Drop-down menu, must add narrative
   f. Drop-down menu, primary and secondary
   g. Narrative of the evaluation criteria that will be used to determine if the grant funding was able to meet the need
   h. Narrative of the challenges anticipated in implementing this project.
# HMEP Proposal

1. **Grant Objectives:**
   a. Each section is made up of a narrative box and has specific instructions.

2. **Accountability to USDOT**
   a. Planning - checkbox of all that apply for established planning objectives for the grant
   b. Training - checkbox of all that apply for the established training objectives for the grant

3. **Funding Plan**
   a. Grant recipients must provide 20% of the direct and indirect costs of all activities covered under the grant award with non-Federal funds.
Homeland Security Foundation Proposal

1. Project Summary- Narrative (2500 characters)
2. Applicant Information- includes all legal information for the applicant
3. Additional Information- includes detailed information about the entity requesting the grant such as operating costs, number of volunteer members, etc.
4. Secure Indiana License Plate- Narrative to include all efforts in promoting the program
5. Statement/ Narrative Description of Project- Narrative to give more detail and overall picture of the needs identified and how the funds will be utilized
6. Project Specifics- Number of persons to benefit from the project
7. Sustainability- Narrative about how the project will be sustained/maintained.
## Secured School Safety 2015 Proposal

I. **Identification Information**  
   A. **Applicant Info**  
   B. **Primary Point of Contact** – the person IDHS contacts for questions about the grant

II. **School Type** – information about whether the entity applying is a single school corporation, single charter school, or a coalition of corporations and/or charter schools.

III. **Proposal Objectives and Activities, Measures**  
   A. **Project Summary** – An overview of the project (a good time to introduce your objectives)  
   B. **Needs Assessment**  
      a. Describe the needs assessment process  
      b. How will this grant help address the needs  
   C. **Challenges/Risks** – it’s not a bad thing to acknowledge you could have challenges

IV. **School Safety Overview**  
   A. **All Hazards Approach**  
   B. **Professional Development**  
   C. **Certified School Safety Specialist**

V. **Law Enforcement**
Secured School Safety 2015 Proposal

VI. County School Safety Commission
   A. Participation – Does the applicant participate?
   B. Member Identification
   C. Meeting Frequency
   D. Performance – check boxes about activities
   E. Recent Meeting – most recent meeting date
   F. School Safety Plan – has the plan been filed with the Commission
   G. Activities – how has the Commission affected the applicant’s school safety plans?

VII. Sustainment – Describe how the program will be maintained if no further funding is available.

VIII. Performance Measures
   A. Quarter Planned Activities
   B. Objectives
      1. Describe the anticipated impact(s) of the activities on the applicants.
      2. What measures will be used to determine whether anticipated impact(s) have occurred?

Attachments
Proposal Changes

• School type description may include additional information
• Needs assessment split into two parts
• Matching funds section in proposal – gone
• More yes/no responses for legal elements
• More emphasis on SMART Objectives.
## Proposal Scoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Needs and Approach</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Project Summary</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Needs Assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Description of the needs assessment process</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Description of how this grant will enable the applicant to address the identified needs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Areas of Need Addressed</strong></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Description of challenges or risks that may impact the planned implementation of the project</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Safety Overview</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Does the applicant take an all hazards approach to school safety?</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Description of the professional development provided to teachers, staff, and other employees to address school safety issues.</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Does the school have a certified school safety specialist?</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Law Enforcement</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Are local law enforcement agencies having jurisdiction listed?</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Does the applicant describe a proactive school based partnership with local law enforcement?</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County School Safety Commission</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Does the applicant participate in the County School Safety Commission</strong></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Are the members listed sufficient to have an effective commission?</strong></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. How often does the commission meet</strong></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Does the commission fulfill the duties described in IC 5-2-10.1-10?</strong></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. Have the minutes of the most recent meeting of the commission been uploaded?</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F. Has the applicant completed a County School Safety Plan and filed it with the commission?</strong></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G. How have the activities of the commission affected the school safety plans of the applicant?</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Proposal Scoring

### Sustainment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Have other funding opportunities been identified or pursued?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Does the proposed plan sustain/maintain the capabilities created or enhanced by this project?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Is there a solid plan to sustain and maintain the plan, if no additional funds are available?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measures</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Are the activities listed sufficient to support the proposal objectives?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Does the applicant include SMART Objectives appropriate to the proposal? (Does the proposal include a description of the impact(s) the activities will have on the applicant’s school safety efforts?)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Does the applicant include appropriate measures to determine whether the anticipated impacts have occurred?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D. Are the budget items reasonable, necessary and allowable?</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Is the budget justification sufficient to explain the necessity of each budget item?</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Score (Add scores for all shaded rows): 100
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