# **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	<b>Total Point Value</b>
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)	20
Advisory committee condition (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 <u>COB</u> <u>November 2, 2020.</u>

	Bitric	George Washington University	Urban Institute
		Initial Screening	
	Your Review	Your Review	Your Review
Organizational Eligiblity: Is the application a university, college, or non profit organization OR a consoritum that combines university, college, and non-profit organizations?		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	NO	YES	YES
Background Information: Does the application include an executive summary, mission/history, and consortium?	NO	YES	YES
und consortium.		Scoring	
	Your Score 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) Expertise in Partnering with Government	1 2 insufficient expertise in education research for urban school distr	Ef lax conducted enterior well-ordinate instance in district and includes an understanding of from enterior impact of by residenth and decision making and includes a "law for Equity to help ensure these issues are consistently dedecessed, in addition," for expanding enterior excess are consistently enterior excess many relevant stress.  3 (demonstrates expertise across many relevant stress.)	the collaborative has conducted actionize declaration research in what districts. Network, the proposed to act and conducted resident for understanding and districts, Network, the proposed data of social for understanding and districts. As the proposed data of social for social data of social for
(Max S points)  Vision for the District RPP, Plan to Leverage Best Practices of RPPS and Philosophy (Max S points, x2 multipler)	2 minimal government parterning expertise	4 4 Case plan and understanding of one BPP principles and mally approxicate bow the structure will ensure that these principles are applied or adopted equally by all partners using the stresswing press, allow a good understanding that researches need to lear in too and may not be experted in a partnership work. As a way common similarly glock of the rank PPP. This is partnership work. As a way common similarly glock of the rank PPP. This family, good discussion of minusal benefit and capacity building and what it means for products to be build in claimate benefit and capacity building and what it means for products to be build in claimate but maintain independence and be credible. This is a forty concept for new IPPP and 5 by way seem in sufference that that cannot be seemed but the cannot be seemed but that cannot be seemed but the seemed but that cannot be seemed but the seemed but that cannot be seemed but the seemed but that cannot be seemed but the seemed but that cannot be seemed but t	The collaborative stated multiple RPP principles but lacked a core understanding of how these principles four facilities are considered and considered the control of the c
Networks & Expertise in Community Outreach (Max 5 points)	local community knowledge but no expertise in community outre 2 2 communicated	reach 0	some of the collaborative seem to have more community outreach 3 apperience than others - unclear how this will be leveraged
Knowledge & Expertise Subtotal (Total 30 points)	8	24	19
Partnership Personnel & Collaboration			
Current Personnel & Personnel Dedicated to			
the Partnership, Consortium Coordination (Max 5 points, x2 multipler)	<sub>O</sub> no staff yet	solid plan and many key spots filled - most imp the exec director and a 4 g. dewardship group which is in addition to 8PP advisors	3 6 key collaborative roles are still TBD but there is a plan in place to fill them good start but needs more understanding of how to ensure these meetings are productive and make sure that after a year of own 4-a year
Advisory Committee Collaboration (Max 5 points, x2 multipler)	1 2 not clear they know what the advisory committee role is	good understanding of how to work with a diverse group to reach consensus and the timeline and stops invo, lived with bringing this group 5 10 together and the exact work they will need to be doing-lots of details	the budget - they end up with a solid set of developed research questions - no details on how they will get there? what does it look like to develop a gresser-of agenda with this type of board?
Partnership Personnel & Collaboration Subtotal (Total 20 points)	2	18	12
Data Use & Protection, Research Methods			
Expertise in Security (Max 5 points, x2 multipler)	1 2	seems good - like the celebral lead sourse management which seems better for collaboration and lear transfer of data. Ultimate decision making a goints they leave up to OSSE / IEA which makes some specific talk of metalst and data sinventories which is very useful. This	seems fine. Some centralized cloud based secure storage could be more useful for a collab with 15 partners than having to always send vid SFTP as g transfers are a weak link in security - plus leads to version control issues
Data Management & Security Plan* (Max 5 points, x2 multiplier)	0 0	represents major work for the first year of every RPP - as ofted in 5 10 Wentworth recent paper - says takes one year, for example	3 6 same as above
Data Use & Protection, Research Methods Subtotal (Total 20 points)	2	18	14
Research Methods			
Validity & Data Quality (Max 5 points, x2 multiplier)	0 0 insuffient quant / data experience or articulation	specific vision for quality checks and how those interact with all groups 4 8 involved which is useful	some partners have higher quality methods than others, unsure how they 3 6 will address and build capacity across the board
Accountability & Transparency (Max 5 points)	1 1	a membered winter a unitary good vision for accountability and transparency and likely consistency across members due to prior RPP work, but could use more evidence to 3 support 3 support	some partners have better accountability transparency than others, same 3 a siabove
Reesarch Methods Subtotal (Total 15 points)	1	n n	9
Financial Management & Proposed Budget			
Financial Management & Proposed Budget*			
(Max 5 points, x3 multiplier) Financial Management & Proposed Budget Subtotal (Total 15 points)	3 not enough detail here to really understand or evaluate	5 1s more specific budget and institutional commitments  15	3 9 seems oil, not too detailed so hard to better assess
	3		9
Total Score	16	86	63