SECTION I. WHAT'S YOUR INNOVATION? (25 PERCENT)		Points
Excellent **7 8**	The applicant's innovative program: • Serves a *specific* target population that was *thoughtfully-selected* based on qualitative and quantitative data; • Has *clearly-defined, realistic but ambitious goals* that *directly* relate to the target population; • Has *relevant and committed partner(s)* with *clearly-defined roles* related to the grant; and • Is *strongly aligned* with one of the Innovation Fund priority areas.	
Good **5 6**	The applicant's innovative program: • Serves a *specific* target population that was selected based on qualitative and quantitative data; • Has *clearly-defined, realistic but ambitious goals* that *mostly* relate to the target population; • Has *relevant and committed partner(s)* with *somewhat clearly-defined* roles related to the grant; and • Is *aligned* with one of the Innovation Fund priority areas.	
Average **3 4**	The applicant's innovative program: • Serves a target population that was selected based on *assumptions*; • Has *somewhat clear goals* that *somewhat* relate to the target population; • Has partners with *loosely-defined roles* related to the grant; and • Is *somewhat aligned* with one of the Innovation Fund priority areas	
Poor **1 2**	The applicant's innovative program: • Has a *vague or unclear* target population that was not selected for any particular reason; • Has *poorly-defined, unrealistic, or unambitious* goals that *do not relate* to the target population; • Has *random partners* that *lack clearly-defined roles* related to the grant; and • Is *not aligned* with one of the Innovation Fund priory areas.	

SECTION II. IS IT *REALLY* INNOVATIVE? (25 PERCENT)		Points
Excellent **7 8**	The applicant's program will: • *Directly* target the *root cause* of the problem they identified; • *Purposely disrupt* existing structures and systems (Level 4 Innovation); and • Has *strong* potential to permanently transform education. • The applicant has a clearly-defined problem and root cause that it identified with numerous data points, including qualitative and quantitative data, and *direct feedback from the target population.*	
Good **5 6**	The applicant's program will: • *Target* the *root cause* of the problem they identified; • Will *change or improve existing structures and systems* (Level 3 Innovation); and • Has potential to permanently transform education. • The applicant has a clearly-defined problem and root cause that it identified with several data points, including qualitative and quantitative data.	
Average **3 4**	The applicant's program will: • Target the *problem* they identified; and • Exist within *existing structures and systems* (Level 2 Innovation). • The applicant identified its problem using a few qualitative and quantitative data points, but mostly using *assumptions.*	
Poor **1 2**	The applicant's program: • Will not target the problem they identified; and • Is something a school or district should already be doing (Level 1 Innovation). • The applicant identified its problem using *assumptions.*	

SECTION III. WHAT'S YOUR PLAN? (15 PERCENT)		Points
Excellent **7 8**	• The scope of work includes *all* critical grant milestones and is *highly likely* to lead to successful program implementation; • Has a *thoughtfully-selected* and *highly-qualified* team that is *strongly* committed to implementing the program per the scope of work.	
Good **5 6**	• The scope of work includes *most* critical grant milestones and is *likely* to lead to successful program implementation; • Has a *qualified* team that is committed to implementing the program per the scope of work.	
Average **3 4**	• The scope of work includes *some* critical grant milestones and is *somewhat likely* to lead to successful program implementation. • Has a team that is committed to implementing the program per the scope of work.	
Poor **1 2**	• The scope of work is *missing* the majority of critical grant milestones and is *unlikely* to lead to successful implementation of the program; • Has an *unqualified or uncommitted* team, or the grant is led by only one person.	

SECTION IV. WHAT WILL YOU DO WITH THE GRANT FUNDING? (15 PERCENT)		Points
Excellent **7 8**	• *100%* of budget items are: (a) allocable (directly relate) to the project, (b) an allowable use of state funds, and (c) reasonable. • The applicant demonstrates others' (district, partners, etc.) commitment to the project by showing it has funding from *multiple sources*. • The budget rationale indicates that: o *All* budget items are necessary for the program's success; and o The applicant calculated the total funding request based *entirely* on the needs of the grant and not the available funding amount. • The applicant provides *strong* evidence that it will sustain the program, if successful, after the grant ends.	
Good **5 6**	• At least *90%* of budget items are: (a) allocable (directly relate) to the project, (b) an allowable use of state funds, and (c) reasonable. • The applicant demonstrates others' (district, partners, etc.) commitment to the project by showing it has funding from *another source.* • The budget rationale indicates that: o *Most* budget items are necessary for the program's success. o The applicant calculated the total funding request based *mostly* on the needs of the grant and not the available funding amount. • The applicant provides *evidence* that it will sustain the program, if successful, after the grant ends.	
Average **3 4**	• At least *75%* of the budget items are: (a) allocable (directly relate) to the project, (b) an allowable use of state funds, and (c) reasonable. • The budget rationale indicates that: o *Some* budget items are necessary for the program's success, but others are superfluous. o The applicant calculated the total funding request based *loosely* on the needs of the grant, but mostly on creating a budget that adds up to the highest possible funding amount. • The applicant provides *some* evidence that it will sustain the program, if successful, after the grant ends.	
Poor **1 2**	• Less than *75%* of budget items are: (a) allocable (directly relate) to the project, (b) an allowable use of state funds, and (c) reasonable. • The budget rationale indicates that: o The budget items are *not necessary* for the program's success. o The applicant calculated the total funding request by creating a budget that adds up to the total funding amount, without considering the actual needs of the grant. • The applicant *does not provide* or provides *weak evidence* that it will sustain the program, if successful, after the grant ends.	

SECTION V. HOW WILL YOU EVALUATE IT? (20 PERCENT)		Points
Excellent **7 8**	The applicant has a ***mixed-methods, quasi-experimental evaluation design*** that: • Includes three to six SMART goals that directly relate to the project; • Includes three goals related to academic outcomes; • Has ***a clear and feasible plan and timeline*** for collecting multiple qualitative and quantitative data points that will ***continuously*** inform course corrections throughout the implementation process AND measure the program's impact on students, teachers and/or leaders. • Has identified a ***feasible comparison group*** of students; and • The applicant provides evidence that it has identified a ***highly-qualified*** external evaluator.	
Good **5 6**	The applicant has a ***mixed-methods, quasi-experimental evaluation design*** that: • Includes three to six goals, most of which are SMART goals, that relate to the project; • Includes three goals related to academic outcomes; • Has a ***clear and feasible plan and timeline*** for collecting multiple qualitative and quantitative data points that will ***periodically*** inform course corrections throughout the implementation process AND measure the program's impact on students, teachers and/or leaders. • Has identified ***a comparison group*** of students; and • The applicant provides evidence that it has identified a ***qualified*** external evaluator.	
Average **3 4**	The applicant has a ***mixed-methods*** evaluation design: • Includes three to six goals that mostly relate to the project, but most of the goals are not SMART; • Fewer than three of the goals relate to academic outcomes; • Has a plan and timeline for collecting qualitative and quantitative data points that will measure the program's impact on students, teachers and/or leaders. • The applicant provides evidence that it has identified an external evaluator.	
Poor **1 2**	The applicant: • Includes goals that do not or loosely relate to the project and are not SMART; • Fewer than three of the goals relate to academic outcomes; • Has an unclear plan and timeline for collecting data related to the grant; • Has identified an ***unqualified*** external evaluator.	