

DC Education Research Practice Partnership Scoring Rubric & Tool

Overview:

The Review Panel will read and score each application. You may find them [here](#). The Scorecard (located in the Scorecard tab) helps reviewers tabulate their scores. Reviewers should enter their values in the column marked "Your Review" or "Your Score" using the drop down beside each cell. The multipliers used to weight certain parts of the rubric are already built into the tool along with all of the math behind tabulating a score.

Scoring:

-Some subsections are weighted more than others. Multipliers are shown below in parenthesis. -

-All subsections are scored on a scale of 0-5 unless marked with an (*). If an (*) scorers should score based on the following values 0, 1, 3, 5.

Scores have the following meaning:

0- Requirement not met

1- Very poor/unclear

2- Poor/Somewhat unclear

3- Fair

4- Good

5- Excellent

Rubric:

In the second meeting of the review committee, we agreed on a rubric that aligned with the notice of invitation. A long form rubric that includes descriptions of each subsection as outlined in the NOI is located [here](#). The short form rubric can be found below:

Sections & Subsections	Total Point Value
<i>Knowledge & Expertise</i>	
-Expertise in Education Research for Urban School Districts & States (x2)	30
-Expertise in Partnering with Government	
-Vision for District RPP, Plan to Leverage Best Practices of RPPs, and Philosophy (x2)	
-Networks & Expertise in Community Outreach	
<i>Partnership Personnel & Collaboration</i>	
-Current Personnel & Personnel Dedicated to the Partnership, Consortium Coordination (x2)	20
-Advisory Committee Collaboration (x2)	
<i>Data Use & Protection Research Methods</i>	
-Expertise in Security (x2)	20
-Data Management & Security Plan (x2)*	
<i>Research Methods</i>	
-Validity & Data Quality (x2)	15
-Accountability & Transparency	
<i>Fiscal Management and Proposed Budget (x3)</i>	15

Comments

Reviewers should feel free to write in comments for their own use using the scoring sheet.

Submission

Reviewers should use the scorecard to tabulate their scores. They should be submitted to Justin Tooley at justin.tooley@dc.gov by **COB November 2, 2020**.

	Bitric	George Washington University	Urban Institute
Initial Screening			
	Your Review	Your Review	Your Review
Organizational Eligibility: Is the application a university, college, or non profit organization OR a consortium that combines university, college, and non-profit organizations?	NO	YES	YES
Timely Submission: Was the application submitted on time?	YES	YES	YES
Period of Commitment: Does the application commit to the 10 year partnership commitment.	YES	YES	YES
Background Information: Does the application include an executive summary, mission/history, and consortium?	NO	YES	YES
Scoring			
	Your Score	Total Score	Comments
Knowledge & Expertise			
<i>Expertise in Education Research for Urban School District & States (Max 5 points, x2 multiplier)</i>	1	2	4 8
<i>Expertise in Partnering with Government (Max 5 points)</i>	1	1	4 4
<i>Vision for the District RPP, Plan to Leverage Best Practices of RPPs and Philosophy (Max 5 points, x2 multiplier)</i>	1	2	5 10
<i>Networks & Expertise in Community Outreach (Max 5 points)</i>	1	1	4 4
Knowledge & Expertise Subtotal (Total 30 points)	6	26	20
Partnership Personnel & Collaboration			
<i>Current Personnel & Personnel Dedicated to the Partnership, Consortium Coordination (Max 5 points, x2 multiplier)</i>	1	2	4 8
<i>Advisory Committee Collaboration (Max 5 points, x2 multiplier)</i>	1	2	5 10
Partnership Personnel & Collaboration Subtotal (Total 20 points)	4	18	14
Data Use & Protection, Research Methods			
<i>Expertise in Security (Max 5 points, x2 multiplier)</i>	1	2	4 8
<i>Data Management & Security Plan* (Max 5 points, x2 multiplier)</i>	1	2	5 10
Data Use & Protection, Research Methods Subtotal (Total 20 points)	4	18	20
Research Methods			
<i>Validity & Data Quality (Max 5 points, x2 multiplier)</i>	0	0	4 8
<i>Accountability & Transparency (Max 5 points)</i>	1	1	4 4
Research Methods Subtotal (Total 15 points)	1	12	12
Financial Management & Proposed Budget			
<i>Financial Management & Proposed Budget* (Max 5 points, x3 multiplier)</i>	0	0	5 15
Financial Management & Proposed Budget Subtotal (Total 15 points)	0	15	15
Total Score	15	89	59

This is not as clear and doesn't give a sense in the difference between the collaborative partners and the advisory board. Also, their description of the Advisory Board stakeholders who will help communicate the findings rather than help guide readers.

I really appreciated the detail for Urban's Security Plan. It is more detailed than GW's, so I gave them the edge in the expertise in security section.

questions remain concerning the size of the collaborative and how that will be managed. I'd like to hear directly from them on this topic.