

SECTION I. WHAT'S YOUR IDEA? (10 PERCENT)		Points
DOES THE APPLICANT DEMONSTRATE LOGICAL THINKING ABOUT THE LINK BETWEEN PROBLEMS, ROOT CAUSES, AND POTENTIAL PROGRAMS?		
<p>Excellent</p> <p>7 8</p>	<p>The applicant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has an idea for an innovative program that is <u>strongly aligned</u> with one of the Innovation Fund priority areas; Identifies a <u>reasonable and well-articulated</u> problem and <u>reasonable and well-articulated</u> potential root causes; and Presents a <u>well-articulated and logical link</u> between the problem/its causes and the program. 	
<p>Good</p> <p>5 6</p>	<p>The applicant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has an idea for an innovative program that is <u>aligned</u> with one of the Innovation Fund priority areas; Identifies a <u>reasonable</u> problem and <u>reasonable</u> potential root causes; and Presents a <u>logical link</u> between the problem/it's causes and the program. 	
<p>Average</p> <p>3 4</p>	<p>The applicant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has an idea for an innovative program; Identifies a <u>problem</u> and <u>potential root causes</u>; and Presents a <u>somewhat logical link</u> between the problem/it's causes and the program. 	
<p>Poor</p> <p>1 2</p>	<p>The applicant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not have an idea for an innovative program; Does not identify a problem or root cause(s) or identifies <u>an unreasonable problem</u> and <u>unreasonable potential root causes</u>; Does not present a link or presents an <u>illogical link</u> between the problem/its causes and the program. 	

SECTION II. WHO IS INVOLVED? (40 PERCENT)		Points
WILL A DYNAMIC TEAM WITH DECISION-MAKING POWER FULLY PARTICIPATE IN THE ACCELERATOR PROCESS?		
Excellent 7 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant’s Accelerator team: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Consists of four to eight, <u>thoughtfully-selected</u> individuals; ○ Includes a school or district-level leader with <u>demonstrated decision-making power</u>; ○ Has members with <u>different perspectives, roles, and strengths</u> within the school, district or community. • The statements of commitment provide <u>strong evidence</u> that each team member will fully participate in the Accelerator process, including the in-person workshops and in-between activities. 	
Good 5 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant’s Accelerator team: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Consists of four to eight, <u>thoughtfully-selected</u> individuals; ○ Includes a school or district-level leader with <u>decision-making power</u>, ○ Has members with <u>somewhat different perspectives, roles and strengths</u> within the school, district or community. • The statements of commitment provide <u>evidence</u> that each team member will fully participate in the Accelerator process, including the in-person workshops and in-between activities. 	
Average 3 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant’s Accelerator team: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Consists of four to eight, <u>somewhat thoughtfully-selected</u> individuals; ○ Includes a school or district-level leader with <u>some decision-making power</u>; ○ Has members with <u>similar perspectives, roles, and strengths</u> within the school or district. • The statements of commitment provide <u>some evidence</u> that each team member will fully participate in the Accelerator process, including the in-person workshops and in-between activities. 	
Poor 1 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant Accelerator team: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Consists of less than four or more than eight individuals OR four to eight <u>randomly-selected individuals</u>; ○ Does not include a school or district-level leader with decision-making power; and ○ Has members with <u>identical or extremely similar</u> perspectives, roles, and strengths within the school, district, or community (ex: all first-grade teachers). • The statements of commitment <u>do not provide evidence or provide weak evidence</u> that each team member will fully participate in the Accelerator process, including the in-person workshops and in-between activities. 	

SECTION III. OTHER QUESTIONS (50 PERCENT/10 PERCENT PER QUESTION)					Points
WILL THE APPLICANT’S MINDSET ENABLE THEM TO SUCCEED IN THE ACCELERATOR?					
Question	Excellent 7 8	Good 5 6	Average 3 4	Poor 1 2	
1	The applicant perceives risk as a positive, productive and necessary part of innovation in education if it is purposeful and likely to benefit students.	The application perceives risk as part of innovation in education if it is purposeful and likely to benefit students.	The applicant views risk as something that should most often be avoided – OR – the applicant views risk as a positive, necessary, and productive part of innovation, but does not think it needs to be purposeful or benefit students.	The applicant views risk as something that should be avoided at all costs – OR – the applicant views risk as something that should always be undertaken, even if it might negatively impact students.	
2	The applicant can think outside or around traditional barriers to innovation in education while still ensuring school provides students with a rigorous, academic curriculum.	The applicant can think outside or around traditional barriers to innovation in education.	The applicant thinks within the confines of the concept of traditional school.	The applicant thinks within the confines of their current school or district.	
3	The applicant has a nuanced and deep understanding of obstacles that prevent all students from achieving academic success. The applicant supports its argument with strong evidence .	The applicant has a firm understanding of obstacles that prevent all students from achieving academic success. The applicant supports its argument with evidence .	The applicant has a basic understanding of obstacles that prevent all students from achieving academic success. The applicant supports its argument with some evidence, but mostly with opinions .	The applicant has a poor understanding of obstacles that prevent all students from achieving academic success. The applicant does not support its argument or supports it with weak evidence and/or opinions .	

SECTION III. OTHER QUESTIONS (CONTINUED)					Points
Question	Excellent 7 8	Good 5 6	Average 3 4	Poor 1 2	
4	The applicant demonstrates it can think critically about data and the reasons behind it by proposing a logical, thoughtful, and nuanced explanation of Georgia’s data. The applicant supports its argument with strong evidence .	The applicant demonstrates it can think critically about data and the reasons behind it by proposing a logical and thoughtful explanation of Georgia’s data. The applicant supports its argument with evidence .	The applicant demonstrates it understands data by proposing a basic explanation of Georgia’s data. The applicant supports its argument with some evidence, but mostly with opinions .	The applicant does not demonstrate it understands data. The applicant proposes an illogical explanation of Georgia’s data. The applicant does not support its argument or supports it with weak evidence and/or opinions .	
5	The applicant demonstrates it can listen to, reflect, and act on critical feedback from students, even when it might not agree with the feedback.	The applicant demonstrates it can listen to and act on critical feedback from students if it mostly agrees with the feedback.	The applicant demonstrates it can listen to critical feedback from students, but does not think it is necessary to act on this feedback.	The applicant demonstrates it cannot listen to or act on critical feedback from students, OR the applicant demonstrates it is defensive when receiving critical feedback.	