# Pennsylvania Accessible Growing Microgrant Rubric

| **Category** | **3 – Excellent*****Fully meets expectations*** | **2 – Good*****Meets most expectations*** | **1 – Fair*****Partially meets expectation*** | **0 – Not Addressed*****Does not meet expectations or is missing*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sustainability | The project has a realistic plan with a clear timeline, budget, and strategies to maintain the accessibility improvements long-term. | The project is mostly realistic but could benefit from more detail in the timeline, budget, or maintenance strategies. | The project has a basic plan but lacks specific details on how accessibility changes will be sustained. | The project doesn’t include a clear or realistic plan implementation or long-term maintenance. |
| Community Engagement | The project works closely with people with disabilities or older adults and includes their input in the planning and decision-making. | The project includes some involvement from people with disabilities or older adults but could do more to include their voices. This project has plans to increase involvement of people with disabilities and/or older adults in the future. | The project mentions working with the community but gives few details or has limited plans. While not included now, this project has plans to increase involvement of people with disabilities and/or older adults in the future. | The project doesn’t include input from people with disabilities or older adults. There is no plan to increase involvement of people with disabilities and/or older adults in the future. |
| Community Impact | The project will benefit a lot of people and clearly shows how it will make the garden more accessible. | The project will help the community but doesn’t show strong evidence of how many people it will reach or benefit. | The project has limited impact and doesn’t clearly show how it will help the community. | The project doesn’t focus on community impact or improving accessibility. |
| Accessibility Improvements | The project has clear and detailed plans to make the garden more accessible for people with disabilities or older adults. It names the specific access needs the changes will address and illustrates knowledge and understanding of the communities they are trying to improve access for. | The project includes plans to improve accessibility for people with disabilities or older adults, but the plans lack detail or only address access needs in a general way. The project may name some access needs but does not demonstrate full understanding of the disability communities being served or how the proposed changes will meet those needs. | The project mentions accessibility but does not include specific plans for how changes will be made or who they are for. There is little to no recognition of disability access needs or how the improvements will support people with disabilities or older adults. | The project does not include any plans to improve accessibility, or it does not mention people with disabilities or older adults at all. There is no recognition of access needs or how changes could support inclusion or usability for disabled community members. |
| Alignment with grant goals | The project strongly aligns with the mini-grant’s goal of improving accessibility in community gardens and shows an understanding of the grant’s purpose. | The project aligns with the grant’s goals but could be more focused or detailed. | The project has weak alignment with the grant goals. | The project doesn’t align with the grant goals. |