

One-Page Scoring Rubric (Reviewer Use)

Proposal Title: _____

Reviewer Name: _____

Criterion	Score (1–5)	Weight	Weighted Score
Student Impact	_____	25%	_____
Mission Alignment	_____	20%	_____
Equity	_____	20%	_____
Feasibility	_____	15%	_____
Budget Justification	_____	10%	_____
Sustainability	_____	10%	_____

Total Score (out of 5.0): _____

Funding Recommendation (check one):

- ☐ Fully Funded
☐ Partially Funded
☐ Not Funded

Comments / Conditions (if applicable):

Anchored Scoring Guidance

Student Impact

- **5** — Deep, meaningful benefit to many students.
- **3** — Moderate impact on many students or deep impact on a targeted group.
- **1** — Limited reach or unclear benefit

Mission Alignment

- **5** — Strongly aligned with PTSA mission and current year priorities
- **3** — Generally aligned but not central to priorities
- **1** — Weak or unclear alignment

Equity

- **5** — Clearly and intentionally supports students with fewer resources or opportunities
- **3** — Some equity benefit, but not a central focus
- **1** — No clear equity impact or may increase existing gaps

Feasibility

- **5** — Well organized plan with realistic timeline, roles, and logistics
- **3** — Workable plan but missing details or contingencies
- **1** — Vague, unrealistic, or lacks capacity to execute

Budget Justification

- **5** — Costs are reasonable, detailed, and directly tied to outcomes
- **3** — Costs appear reasonable but lack clarity or detail
- **1** — Costs are unclear, inflated, or poorly justified

Sustainability

- **5** — Onetime or low maintenance project with no ongoing funding expectations
- **3** — Some ongoing needs, but manageable or partially addressed
- **1** — Creates long term funding dependency the PTSA cannot sustain