

Innovation Funding Initiative

Investing in bold ideas. Creating lasting impacts.



Orange County Department of Education (OCDE)

RFA SCORING RUBRIC

Innovation Funding Initiative: **Cohort 2**

Note: This scoring rubric is identical to the one provided in the RFA.



Application Scoring

Applications will be scored based on the categories and descriptions in the following table. Applicant must earn a minimum of 60 points overall and at least the minimum points required in each category shown in the table below to be considered for a funding award.

Scoring Category	Description	Total Points Available	Minimum Points Needed
Eligibility requirements	Applicant meets all eligibility requirements, submits all required application documents by the deadline, and agrees to all requirements included in the Applicant Agreement Form.	Applicant must meet eligibility requirements. No points awarded.	

Project Need and Alignment	Applicant provides background information and relevant data to justify the need for this project in their school(s). A description is included of what the district is already doing to address the need and how the innovation will elevate, replace or complement those efforts. Applicant cites relevant theory or preliminary work that supports the potential efficacy of the innovative approach(es) proposed. A compelling rationale for the project is provided. Applicant describes how the project aligns with current school, district, and countywide goals. For instance, the application references the project's alignment to SPSAs, LCAP, or other state, local, district, or school plans and clearly states how the project aligns with OCDE 5-3-1 Strategic Plan. Applicant describes how the innovation is aligned with relevant standards. Applicant describes how the project is responsive to and/or has support from their school communities (e.g., description of how the voice of families, students, and staff were considered in developing the project).	20 points	10 points
Project Design and Quality	Applicant describes how the project is innovative, and how it aligns to the innovation definition provided in this RFA. The applicant explains how the project is evidence-based and/or grounded in theory, with clearly stated measurable objectives (including at least one student outcome). The design is well-explained, with logically-connected steps clearly connecting proposed activities with anticipated outcomes. Project shows potential for meaningful impact, broadly across student populations or deeply within a specific student group. Overall, the project reflects high quality, intentional planning reflected in the implementation plan and timeline.	35 points	18 points
Feasibility of Project	Applicant describes capacity and readiness to implement the project, including completed <i>Readiness/Feasibility for Project Implementation</i> table; identifies key personnel, responsibilities, roles, expertise, and project team structure; identifies	25 points	13 points

Feasibility of Project (continued)	contributions from community partners. Applicant addresses factors impacting implementation such as site and district readiness (e.g., current site administrator and staff support for the project, site and district ability to integrate proposed processes into existing structures and initiatives, existing resources relevant to the project, such as materials, staff, training structures). Applicant explains role of school site leadership in project and application development. Applicant identifies potential challenges that may impede timely start-up or implementation of the project, such as staff turnover in key project leadership and/or implementation staff, delays in hiring processes, competing priorities, and limited staff resources. Applicant describes how challenges will be addressed. If renovation, construction, or equipment purchases are needed for the project, applicant describes processes for ensuring timely acquisition of materials, strategies for securing timely approvals, permits, etc. Applicant describes staff capacity to attend learning community and planning sessions and Innovation Summit, and for collaborating with the OCDE Evaluator and Implementation Coaches to monitor implementation, collect and analyze data, and complete evaluation and reporting tasks. While optional, Letters of Support may further strengthen evidence of readiness and capacity for successful project implementation.		
Evaluation Planning	Applicant describes a clear and coherent plan for monitoring progress and measuring project success. Applicant explains how success will be defined and measured – specifically, how the project will demonstrate impact on the identified need, challenge, or barrier to student success. Applicant identifies both implementation (process) and impact (outcome) measures that are directly aligned to goals/objectives. At least one student outcome is proposed that aligns with a Differentiated	5 points	2 points

	Assistance eligibility indicator or student group. School, staff, and district outcomes may also be identified. Applicant includes a completed Metrics Table with an explanation for why the included metrics are meaningful in measuring the project's success and impact. Goals in the Metrics Table are identical to the goals proposed in the Implementation Plan.		
Strategies for Scaling and Sustainability	Applicant addresses initial planning for sustaining the project, such as integrating the project into school or district plans, securing ongoing funding, exploring potential partnerships, and fostering mindset or culture shifts that promote long-term continuation of the innovative practice or their impacts. Applicant provides specific examples. Applicant describes their plan to scale the project within their district during or after the project period. Applicant also provides a plan, with examples, for sharing lessons learned and promising innovative strategies with educational partners to enhance adoption/adaptation of practices in other districts.	5 points	2 points
Budget Workbook Template and Narrative	Applicant submits a budget for the project using the required budget template. Costs comply with allowable costs and stated maximums. Applicant provides a justification of the costs by category with a clear, detailed, reasonable and necessary budget that is aligned to the proposed activities and implementation plan. If relevant, the applicant also describes any leveraged funding or in-kind support in the narrative budget that may be needed to support project implementation.	10 points	3 points
Applicant must score a minimum of 60 points to be considered for an award. Receiving the minimum number of points in each category does not total 60 points, so applicants must score higher than the minimum in at least some categories to be considered for an award. Additionally, scoring 60 points does not guarantee funding.			

Applications failing to adhere to required formatting guidelines may lose up to 2 points from their total application score. Please carefully check the formatting guidelines outlined in Section II.A2 and throughout this document.

For each scoring category, points will be allocated based on the thoroughness and quality of information provided, using the following rubric as a guide.

Exemplary (maximum points awarded)	Strong Response (75-99% of points awarded)	Adequate Response (50-74% of points awarded)	Limited Response (1-49% of points awarded)	Minimal/Not Addressed (no points awarded)
•Fully addresses the prompts, exceeds expectations. •Clear, compelling, well-documented response. •Strongly aligned with program goals and demonstrates high potential for success/impact. •No significant weaknesses identified.	•Meets requirements at a high level of quality. •Well-developed and mostly well-supported with evidence. •Minor gaps or weaknesses, but overall strong alignment and feasibility.	•Meets minimum requirements. •Provides some relevant information, though it may be general, incomplete, or uneven in quality. •Shows potential, but additional detail or evidence would be better.	•Meets some but not all requirements. •Information is vague, underdeveloped or inconsistently presented. •Important elements are missing or only partially described.	•Does not sufficiently address the prompt. •Information is vague, missing, or not relevant. •Lacks the detail needed to assess quality or feasibility.