

INNOVATION FUND
FISCAL YEAR 2019 SCALING GRANT RUBRIC

SECTION I. WHAT INNOVATION ARE YOU SCALING? (15 PERCENT)		Points
Excellent 7 8	<p>The applicant's innovative program:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Serves a <i>specific</i> target population that was <i>thoughtfully-selected</i> based on qualitative and quantitative data; • Has <i>clearly-defined, realistic but ambitious goals</i> that <i>directly</i> relate to the target population; • Has <i>relevant and committed partner(s)</i> with <i>clearly-defined roles</i> related to the grant; and • Is <i>strongly aligned</i> with one of the Innovation Fund priority areas. 	
Good 5 6	<p>The applicant's innovative program:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Serves a <i>specific</i> target population that was selected based on qualitative and quantitative data; • Has <i>clearly-defined, realistic but ambitious goals</i> that <i>mostly</i> relate to the target population; • Has <i>relevant and committed partner(s)</i> with <i>somewhat clearly-defined</i> roles related to the grant; and • Is <i>aligned</i> with one of the Innovation Fund priority areas. 	
Average 3 4	<p>The applicant's innovative program:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Serves a target population that was selected based on <i>assumptions</i>; • Has <i>somewhat clear goals</i> that <i>somewhat</i> relate to the target population; • Has partners with <i>loosely-defined roles</i> related to the grant; and • Is <i>somewhat aligned</i> with one of the Innovation Fund priority areas 	
Poor 1 2	<p>The applicant's innovative program:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has a <i>vague or unclear</i> target population that was not selected for any particular reason; • Has <i>poorly-defined, unrealistic, or unambitious</i> goals that do not relate to the target population; • Has <i>random partners</i> that <i>lack clearly-defined roles</i> related to the grant; and • Is <i>not aligned</i> with one of the Innovation Fund priory areas. 	

SECTION II. WHY SHOULD YOU SCALE THIS PROGRAM? (20 PERCENT)		Points
Excellent 7 8	The applicant: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has a <i>thoughtful and logical</i> explanation for why it is scaling the program; Has a clearly-defined problem and root cause that it identified with numerous data points, including qualitative and quantitative data, and <i>direct feedback from the target population</i>. Includes <i>strong qualitative and quantitative evidence</i> that the program it is scaling has successfully addressed a similar problem and root cause and is <i>highly likely</i> to yield similar outcomes when scaled. The applicant's program will <i>directly</i> target the <i>root cause</i> of the problem it identified. 	
Good 5 6	The applicant: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has a <i>logical</i> explanation for why it is scaling the program; Has a clearly-defined problem and root cause that it identified with several data points, including qualitative and quantitative data. Includes <i>qualitative and quantitative evidence</i> that the program it is scaling has successfully addressed a similar problem and root cause and is <i>likely</i> to yield similar outcomes when scaled. The applicant's program will <i>target</i> the <i>root cause</i> of the problem it identified. 	
Average 3 4	The applicant: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has a <i>basic</i> explanation for why it is scaling the program; Has a problem it identified using a few qualitative and quantitative data points, but mostly using <i>assumptions</i>; and Includes <i>some evidence</i> that the program it is scaling has successfully addressed a similar problem and root cause and is <i>somewhat likely</i> to yield similar outcomes when scaled. The applications program will target the problem it identified. 	
Poor 1 2	The applicant: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has an <i>unclear or illogical</i> explanation for why it is scaling the program; Has a problem it identified using using <i>assumptions</i>; and Includes <i>weak evidence</i> that the program it is scaling has successfully addressed a similar problem and root cause; and The program is unlikely to be successful when scaled. The applicant's program will not target the problem or root cause it identified. 	

SECTION III. IS IT <i>REALLY</i> INNOVATIVE? (15 PERCENT)		Points
Excellent 7 8	The applicant's program will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Purposely disrupt</i> existing structures and systems (Level 4 Innovation); and • Has <i>strong</i> potential to permanently transform education. 	
Good 5 6	The applicant's program will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will <i>change or improve existing structures and systems</i> (Level 3 Innovation); and • Has potential to permanently transform education. 	
Average 3 4	The applicant's program will exist within <i>existing structures and systems</i> (Level 2 Innovation)	
Poor 1 2	The applicant's program is something a school or district should already be doing (Level 1 Innovation)	

SECTION VI. WHAT'S YOUR PLAN? (15 PERCENT)		Points
Excellent 7 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The scope of work includes <i>all</i> critical grant milestones and is <i>highly likely</i> to lead to successful program implementation; Has a <i>thoughtfully-selected</i> and <i>highly-qualified</i> team that is <i>strongly</i> committed to implementing the program per the scope of work. 	
Good 5 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The scope of work includes <i>most</i> critical grant milestones and is <i>likely</i> to lead to successful program implementation; Has a <i>qualified</i> team that is committed to implementing the program per the scope of work. 	
Average 3 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The scope of work includes <i>some</i> critical grant milestones and is <i>somewhat likely</i> to lead to successful program implementation. Has a team that is committed to implementing the program per the scope of work. 	
Poor 1 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The scope of work is <i>missing</i> the majority of critical grant milestones and is <i>unlikely</i> to lead to successful implementation of the program; Has an <i>unqualified or uncommitted</i> team, or the grant is led by only one person. 	

SECTION V. WHAT WILL YOU DO WITH THE GRANT FUNDING? (15 PERCENT)		Points
Excellent 7 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ All budget items are necessary for the program's success; and ○ 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Most budget items are necessary for the program's success. ○ 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Some budget items are necessary for the program's success, but others are superfluous. ○ 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The budget items are not necessary for the program's success. ○ 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 VI. HOW WILL YOU EVALUATE IT? (20 PERCENT)		Points
Excellent 7 8	<p>The applicant has a <i>mixed-methods, quasi-experimental evaluation design</i> that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes three to six SMART goals that directly relate to the project; • Includes three goals related to academic outcomes; • Has a <i>clear and feasible plan and timeline</i> for collecting multiple qualitative and quantitative data points that will <i>continuously</i> inform course corrections throughout the implementation process AND measure the program's impact on students, teachers and/or leaders. • Has identified a <i>feasible comparison group</i> of students; and • The applicant provides evidence that it has identified a <i>highly-qualified</i> external evaluator. 	
Good 5 6	<p>The applicant has a <i>mixed-methods, quasi-experimental evaluation design</i> that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <i>clear and feasible plan and timeline</i> for collecting multiple qualitative and quantitative data points that will <i>periodically</i> inform course corrections throughout the implementation process AND measure the program's impact on students, teachers and/or leaders. • Has identified a <i>comparison group</i> of students; and • The applicant provides evidence that it has identified a <i>qualified</i> external evaluator. 	
Average 3 4	<p>The applicant has a <i>mixed-methods</i> evaluation design:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	<p>The applicant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <i>unqualified</i> external evaluator. 	