

| SECTION I. WHAT INNOVATION ARE YOU SCALING? 15 PERCENT | | Points |
|--|--|--------|
| <p>Excellent</p> <p>7 8</p> | <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. | |
| <p>Good</p> <p>5 6</p> | <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. | |
| <p>Average</p> <p>3 4</p> | <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 | |
| <p>Poor</p> <p>1 2</p> | <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 |
|---|---|--------|
| <p>Excellent</p> <p>7 8</p> | <p>The applicant:</p> <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. <p>The applicant's program will <i>directly</i> target the <i>root cause</i> of the problem it identified.</p> | |
| <p>Good</p> <p>5 6</p> | <p>The applicant:</p> <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. <p>The applicant's program will <i>target</i> the <i>root cause</i> of the problem it identified.</p> | |
| <p>Average</p> <p>3 4</p> | <p>The applicant:</p> <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. <p>The applications program will target the problem it identified.</p> | |
| <p>Poor</p> <p>1 2</p> | <p>The applicant:</p> <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. <p>The applicant's program will not target the problem or root cause it identified.</p> | |

| SECTION II. 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 III. 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 IV. WHAT WILL YOU DO WITH THE GRANT FUNDING? (15 PERCENT) | | Points |
|---|--|--------|
| <p>Excellent</p> <p>7 8</p> | <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. | |
| <p>Good</p> <p>5 6</p> | <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. | |
| <p>Average</p> <p>3 4</p> | <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. | |
| <p>Poor</p> <p>1 2</p> | <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 V. HOW WILL YOU EVALUATE IT? (20 PERCENT) | | Points |
|---|--|--------|
| <p>Excellent</p> <p>7 8</p> | <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 <p>The applicant provides evidence that it has identified a <i>highly-qualified</i> external evaluator.</p> | |
| <p>Good</p> <p>5 6</p> | <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 <p>The applicant provides evidence that it has identified a <i>qualified</i> external evaluator.</p> | |
| <p>Average</p> <p>3 4</p> | <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. <p>The applicant provides evidence that it has identified an external evaluator.</p> | |
| <p>Poor</p> <p>1 2</p> | <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. | |