

## 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:

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

### 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](mailto:justin.tooley@dc.gov) by **COB November 2, 2020.**

	Bitric		George Washington University		Urban Institute
<b>Initial Screening</b>					
	<b>Your Review</b>		<b>Your Review</b>		<b>Your Review</b>
<b>Organizational Eligibility:</b> Is the application a university, college, or non profit organization OR a consortium that combines university, college, and non-profit organizations?			<b>YES</b>		<b>YES</b>
<b>Timely Submission:</b> Was the application submitted on time?	<b>YES</b>		<b>YES</b>		<b>YES</b>
<b>Period of Commitment:</b> Does the application commit to the 10 year partnership commitment?	<b>NO</b>		<b>YES</b>		<b>YES</b>
<b>Background Information:</b> Does the application include an executive summary, mission/history, and consortium?	<b>NO</b>		<b>YES</b>		<b>YES</b>
<b>Scoring</b>					
	Your Score	Total Score	Comments	Your Score	Total Score
<b>Knowledge &amp; Expertise</b>					
<i>Expertise in Education Research for Urban School District &amp; States (Max 5 points, x2 multiplier)</i>	1	2	insufficient expertise in education research for urban school districts	5	10
<i>Expertise in Partnering with Government (Max 5 points)</i>	2	2	minimal government partnering expertise	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	no real understanding of what an RPP is	5	10
<i>Networks &amp; Expertise in Community Outreach (Max 5 points)</i>	2	2	local community knowledge but no expertise in community outreach communicated	0	0
<b>Knowledge &amp; Expertise Subtotal (Total 30 points)</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>		<b>24</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Partnership Personnel &amp; Collaboration</b>					
<i>Current Personnel &amp; Personnel Dedicated to the Partnership, Consortium Coordination (Max 5 points, x2 multiplier)</i>	0	0	no staff yet	4	8
<i>Advisory Committee Collaboration (Max 5 points, x2 multiplier)</i>	1	2	not clear they know what the advisory committee role is	5	10
<b>Partnership Personnel &amp; Collaboration Subtotal (Total 20 points)</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>		<b>18</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Data Use &amp; Protection, Research Methods</b>					
<i>Expertise in Security (Max 5 points, x2 multiplier)</i>	1	2		4	8
<i>Data Management &amp; Security Plan* (Max 5 points, x2 multiplier)</i>	0	0		5	10
<b>Data Use &amp; Protection, Research Methods Subtotal (Total 20 points)</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>		<b>18</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Research Methods</b>					
<i>Validity &amp; Data Quality (5 points, x2 multiplier)</i>	0	0	insufficient quant / data experience or articulation	4	8
<i>Accountability &amp; Transparency (Max 5 points)</i>	1	1		3	3
<b>Research Methods Subtotal (Total 15 points)</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>		<b>11</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Financial Management &amp; Proposed Budget</b>					
<i>Financial Management &amp; Proposed Budget* (Max 5 points, x3 multiplier)</i>	1	3	not enough detail here to really understand or evaluate	5	15
<b>Financial Management &amp; Proposed Budget Subtotal (Total 15 points)</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>		<b>15</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>16</b>		<b>86</b>	<b>63</b>