



Community Impact Challenge

2022-2023

Scoring Rubric

This rubric provides evaluative criteria for Community Impact Challenge (CIC) proposals in six areas:

- I. *Need:* The proposal states its objective, including how the proposed activity addresses an ongoing and/or future community need.
- II. *Innovation:* The proposal highlights the project’s original, innovative, or creative aspect(s).
- III. *Best Practices:* The proposal references how best practices for community engagement will be incorporated into the planning and implementation of the activity (See Appendix A: Best Practices for Responsible Community Engagement).
- IV. *Feasibility and Sustainability:*
 - A. The proposal outlines the logistical needs and other resources that will be necessary for successful implementation.
 - B. The proposal demonstrates the PT or PTA program’s (and other collaborators) ability to accomplish the proposed activity within a defined timeframe and speaks to the sustainability of the activity.
- V. *Impact:* The proposal describes its goals and outcomes, and how its anticipated impact will be measured/assessed.
- VI. *Resources:* The proposal details its anticipated budget, and appears reasonable, fiscally responsible, and sustainable.

	Excellent – 5 points	Good – 4 points	Average – 3 points	Poor – 0 points
I.	Showed strong, clear support (e.g. use of data/statistics) indicating the need for the project in a defined community. Addressed significance of the project for current and future use.	Showed some support indicating the need for the project in a community; showed importance of the project for current and future use.	Showed limited support for the need for the project in a local community; includes some elaboration on either the current or future use.	Does not support how the proposed activity addresses a community need.
II.	The description of the project is clear and it’s evident that the proposed project is original and innovative.	Generalized description of the project, with some evidence of original, innovative, or creative aspect(s).	The project contains no or few original, innovative, or creative aspect(s).	The proposed project/activity already exists in the identified community and the proposal does not address how it will be enhanced in new, innovative or creative ways.

III.	Best practices for meaningful community engagement are clearly integrated (all 5 principles) into the proposal and referenced appropriately.	Some evidence (3-4 principles) of best practices for meaningful community engagement is integrated into the proposal.	Minimal evidence (1-2 principles) of consideration of best practices to facilitate meaningful community engagement.	No evidence of integration of best practices for meaningful community engagement.
IV. A.	Includes detailed description of the major steps for successful implementation within a proposed timeframe and identifies components needed for sustainability.	Includes description of the major steps to implement the program, some specificity of the timeline of activities.	Includes a description of some of the steps for implementation but does not outline the timing of necessary actionable steps toward implementation.	May have only listed information rather than described or explained steps.
IV. B.	Includes detailed description of logistical needs and additional resources that will be necessary for successful implementation.	Includes general description of logistical needs and additional resources that will be necessary for successful implementation.	Proposal may have only listed necessary resources, without providing evidence of need.	Does not address logistical needs and resources that may be necessary for the project/activity.
V.	The goals/outcomes of the project are clearly stated. Methods for assessing impact are described in detail.	The goals/outcomes of the project are stated, and the proposal addresses how impact will be measured.	The goals/outcomes of the project are not clearly stated or methods for measuring impact are not reasonable.	The goals/outcomes of the project/activity are not clearly stated and there is no objective method for assessing impact.
VI.	Thoroughly addressed each anticipated cost/expenditure with a clear justification; provided an itemized budget to support projected expenditures.	Addressed each anticipated cost/expenditure with a clear justification; provided an account for major expenses.	Addressed anticipated costs/expenditures with a basic justification.	Did not provide an itemized budget or address the justification for anticipated costs/expenditures.

Total Score: ___/35 points

**In the event of a tie, multipliers will be utilized to score the following 2 criteria: Feasibility and Sustainability (x5) and Innovation (x4). The proposal with the highest score after being calculated with the use of multipliers for those 2 criteria, will be the designated winner.