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 socre.

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 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
Knowledge & Expertise	
-Expertise in Education Resaerch 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	
Partnership Personnel & Collaboration	
-Current Personnel & Personnel Dedicated to the Partnership, Consortium Coordination (x2)	**20**
-Advisory Committee Collaboration (x2)	
Data Use & Protection Research Methods	
-Expertise in Security (x2)	**20**
-Data Management & Security Plan (x2)*	
Research Methods	
-Validity & Data Quality (x2)	**15**
-Accountability & Transparency	
Fiscal Management and Proposed Budget (x3)	**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

	Bitric — Your Review - FAILS INITIAL SCREENING		George Washington University — Your Review	Urban Institute — 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**	Bitric claims to be a nonprofit, but there really isn't much evidence to support it. The application says that it has no financial support and no current staff. The website that I could find for it showed a website that looked like a bookstore, not a nonprofit - www.bitric.org	**YES**	**YES**
Timely Submission: Was the application submitted on time?	**YES**		**YES**	
Period of Commitment: Does the application commit to the 10 year partnership commitment	**NO**	The applicant fails to demonstrate that it has the financial csupports in place to fulfill a 10 year partnership.	**YES**	**YES**
Background Information: Does the application include an executive summary, mission/history, and consortium?	**NO**	Bitric's application is to design, test, and implement its own curriculum. Bitric does not demonstrate experience conducting research based on rigorous research methods and says that it is not interested in evaluating existing instructional practices.	**YES**	**YES**

Scoring

	Your Score	Multiplier (if applicable)	Total Score	Comments		Your Score	Total Score	Comments	Your Score	Total Score	Comments
Knowledge & Expertise											
Expertise in Education Research for Urban School District & States (Max 5 points, x2 multiplier)	0	2	0			5	10	Research on a broad range of topics in urban & state settings: in same-race teachers on student outcomes, principal supervisors, principle initiative program evaluation, turnaround strategies, technology-based professional development, school climate data, new graduation requirements, rapid school improvement	5	10	Like that they highlight expertise in certain areas, such as qualitative studies (with several examples). Quite a broad set of exertise and extensive work in urban districts
Expertise in Partnering with Government (Max 5 points)	1		0			3	3	Consortium members have partnered with government but the consortium's leader – GW's Graduate School of Education – does not seem to have. Only evidence is that one professor partnered with OSSE via DC STEM	5	5	Deep expertise in partering with government. Many examples from Urban and their consortium members.
Vision for the District RPP, Plan to Leverage Best Practices of RPPS and Philosophy (Max 5 points, x2 mulipler)	2		0			3	6	Concerned about their vision for the RPP's independence. Said that they will seek approval from OSSE for each project, while this should be the role of the Advisory Board. Seems to prioritize connections with OSSE and DME over the Advisory Committee (pg 10). They have RPP advisors, which I like (pg 16)	5	10	I appreciate their emphasis on doing research that is useful. Emphasis on collaboration. Has brought on RPP advisors. Like that they have RPP lessons learned.
Networks & Expertise in Community Outreach (Max 5 points)	1		0			2	2	Doesn't offer examples of GW's School of Education leading a research network. Not clear from letter of support what resarch support/outreach Children's Law Center would provide. Great to have Children's Hospital onboard, but they aren't an educational institution. Doesn't demonstrate deep experience with community engagement, only citing a series at a coffee shop and holding several forums	5	5	Raise DC seems especially helpful. Like that the partnership is made up of members that can engage different sets of stakeholders, i.e. educators and families. Has plans to communicate findings to different audiences.
Knowledge & Expertise Subtotal *(Total 30 points)*			0				21			30	
Partnership Personnel & Collaboration											
Current Personnel & Personnel Dedicated to the Partnership, Consortium Coordination (Max 5 points, x2 mulipler)		2	0			5	10	I appreciate their approach of starting small and scaling up. I also like that staffing will depend on the nature of then inquiry. Unsure that they have already named an Executive Director, seems like they should go through a hiring search.	5	10	They also start with a smaller team and allow it to grow over time and bring in subject matter experts.
Advisory Committee Collaboration (Max 5 points, x2 mulipler)		2	0			5	10	Robust plan for collaboration.	5	10	Robust plan ot provide support to the Advisory Committee and specific coordination that they will provide, including grants management
Partnership Personnel & Collaboration Subtotal (Total 20 points)			0				20			20	
Data Use & Protection, Research Methods											
Expertise in Security (Max 5 points, x2 mulipler)	0	2	0			5	10	I do not have a background in cyber security, but it seems fine to me.	5	10	I have no background in cyber security, but I'm impressed by their experience with sensitive data, such as TANF data, SSNs, vital records
Data Management & Security Plan (Max 5 points, x2 mulipler)*		2	0			5	10	I appreciate their policy of only granting users access to specific segments of data. I don't know enough to evaluate their AWS cloud platform's security, but I wonder if having it connected to the cloud would open a backdoor for hackers.	5	10	Likes that the confidential data is stored on a separate system from Urban's system. Appreciate that data use goes through IRB. Collaborative members don't have automatic access to data.
Data Use & Protection, Research Methods Subtotal (Total 20 points)			0				20			20	
Research Methods											
Validity & Data Quality (Max 5 points, x2 multiplier)		2	0			5	10	Has experience reviewing, editing cleaning data. Will create formal data documentation. Will get data quality review from independent analyst. Has an IRB	5	10	Has IRB protocols. Like the process that two unaffiliated researchers will revie projects at three different stages. Likes that the statistical programming code is independently verified. Appreciate bringing in DC data experts for techncial advisory committee. Process for flagging data quality issues
Accountability & Transparency (Max 5 points)	0	1	0			3	3	I'm concerned that they will obtain OSSE's approval before engaging in research projects.	5	5	Their commitment to funding transparency is appreciated
Reesarch Methods Subtotal (Total 15 points)			0				13			15	
Financial Management & Proposed Budget											
Financial Management & Proposed Budget (Max 5 points, x3 multiplier)*	0	3	0			3	9	I'm concerned that they build in a $500k contribution from DC government into their budget in Years 2-5. This ongoing commitment isn't funded in District's budget	5	15	Like the granularity of their proposed budget, e.g. what they will spend on the website versus data archives. Interested that they think that taking $ from DC government could compromise their perceived credibility. Wonder why they don't have the same hangups about taking money from foundations.
Financial Management & Proposed Budget Subtotal (Total 15 points)			0				9			15	
Total Score			0				83			100	