

Scoring Matrix For President Innovation Fund Proposals (PIF).

All five members of President’s Cabinet are the reviewers of the proposals. Thus, the maximum amount of points a proposal could get is 125. A proposal must have a score of at least 100 to be funded. Additionally, any proposal that receives a “1” in any category by least three of the five reviewers will not receive funding.

	Exceptional (5 Points)	Strong (4 Points)	Average (3 Points)	Weak (2 Points)	Minimal (1 Point)
Alignment with EMP Goals or the Access, Complete, Elevate Strategic Focus	Demonstrates direct, specific, and compelling alignment with multiple EMP priorities. Clearly advances equitable access, completion, or economic mobility, or other signature Skyline goals. Shows strong understanding of institutional context and contributes to districtwide or collegewide efforts.	Shows solid alignment with at least one major EMP goal or college priority related to ACE. Connects project purpose to student success or community impact, though not as deeply integrated as a “5” score proposal	General mention of EMP goals or ACE strategic priorities. Alignment is plausible but not well explained or not central to the project’s design.	Minimal or unclear connection to institutional goals. Alignment appears incidental or surface-level only.	No meaningful alignment demonstrated. Project does not address student success, access, equity, or community impact in a strategic way or a deeply meaningful way.
Impact & Outcomes	Clearly defines who benefits, how many benefit, and what will change because of this project. Includes specific, quantifiable outcomes (KPIs, metrics, benchmarks). Describes realistic evaluation methods and demonstrates strong return on investment for students/community.	Outcomes are stated and measurable but not fully robust or not tied to evaluation tools. Impact is clear but missing some detail on the outcomes	Outcomes are mentioned but they are not very specific or measurable. (“Increase engagement,” “support success,” etc.) Impact is present but not well quantified.	Outcomes are vague, unmeasurable, or unrealistic. Limited sense of who benefits or how.	No measurable outcomes provided. Impact cannot be assessed.
Feasibility & Sustainability	Clear work plan, timeline, responsible team members, and logistics. Demonstrates capacity to launch and manage the project successfully. Sustainability plan describes how impact continues after PIF funds end.	Strong implementation plan but sustainability plan is modest or partially developed	Feasible but lacks detail on timeline, roles, or follow-through. Sustainability is mentioned but unclear.	Major concerns about viability, staffing, timeline, approvals, or readiness.	Project is not realistically implementable in the proposed year. No sustainability or continuation strategy. Project violates clear rules or policies in the District.
Innovation & Collaboration	Highly creative idea, novel approach, or first-of-its-kind activity at Skyline. Demonstrates cross-departmental partnerships, external collaboration, or interdisciplinary thinking. Shows clear added value beyond standard operations.	Strong innovation OR strong collaboration (one is excellent, the other adequate).	Some new ideas or minor enhancements. Collaboration is limited or informal.	Little innovation: project resembles existing work. No significant partnership	No innovation or collaboration demonstrated.
Budget	Budget is clear, well-justified, and realistic, aligned with proposed activities. Demonstrates efficient use of resources and appropriate cost structure. Includes accurate quotes, correct category usage, and no unnecessary costs.	Budget is clear overall but includes minor gaps or items needing clarification.	Budget is plausible but lacks detail, rationale, or precision. Some items appear miscategorized or underexplained.	Budget includes questionable expenses, unclear rationale, or missing cost details.	Budget is incomplete, inaccurate, or not connected to the project narrative. Too many expenses that cannot be done.