

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.**

George Washington University

Urban Institute

Initial Screening

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?	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	YES	YES
Background Information: Does the application include an executive summary, mission/history, and consortium?	YES	YES

Scoring

	Your Score	Total Score	Comments	Your Score	Total Score	Comments
Knowledge & Expertise						
<i>Expertise in Education Research for Urban School District & States (Max 5 points, x2 multiplier)</i>	5	10	Page 11: Experience in a number of urban school districts and states. Both qualitative and quantitative. Did not include lessons learned (required by NOI)	4	4	Page 7: Experience with qualitative and quantitative data ub a number of state education systems and urban areas. However, does not include implementation time-frame, dates of work conducted, and lessons learned in the main application (required by NOI).
<i>Expertise in Partnering with Government (Max 5 points)</i>	5	5	Page 13: Showed how they would developed research questions jointly, described interim deliverables, provided results in multiple format, ensured that work was useful and productive for government partner. Built capacity for government partner.	5	5	Page 10: Showed how the research questions were developed, describes interim deliverables, communicated in a meaningful way, adjusted the projects in response to stakeholder feedback, ensured that work was useful and productive for government partners, built capacity. Seems to have provided work in multiple formats but this isn't fully described, but not worth dingling them
<i>Vision for the District RPP, Plan to Leverage Best Practices of RPPS and Philosophy (Max 5 points, x2 multiplier)</i>	5	10	Page 15: Demonstrates knowledge of similar partnerships in other states, details how they will use best practices and lessons learned to apply to DC context	5	10	Page 12: Shows knowledge of similar partnerships in other states, explains how they will apply best practices and lessons learned to DC context
<i>Networks & Expertise in Community Outreach (Max 5 points)</i>	3	3	Page 17: Lists existing partnerships. Doesn't contain specific info on how they would integrate new partnerships. Does not provide examples of the lead organization engaging community, rather citing work done by partner orgs. The examples cited by consortium members are a bit thin, such as sponsoring an event at a coffee shop. Does not provide examples of how they would employ multiple mediums to communicate to diverse audiences	5	5	Page 16: Lists some partnerships, specifies how they would identify new partners. Can't access appendices to verify letters of support. Robust experience coordinating and conducting community outreach to engage diverse stakeholders. Describes employing multiple mediums to reach diverse audiences
Knowledge & Expertise Subtotal (Total 30 points)		28			28	
Partnership Personnel & Collaboration						
<i>Current Personnel & Personnel Dedicated to the Partnership, Consortium Coordination (Max 5 points, x2 multiplier)</i>	5	10	Page 19: Describes current staffing, organizational chart, plans for increasing capacity, nature of staffing. Provides resumes. Describes consortium structure, roles and responsibilities, governance, decision making.	5	10	Page 18: Describes current personnel, provides staffing plan, organizational chart. Provides resumes. Describes consortium's organizational structure, roles and responsibilities, governance, decision making
<i>Advisory Committee Collaboration (Max 5 points, x2 multiplier)</i>	5	10	Page 21: Provides processes for working with the advisory committee. Very thoughtful and collaborative approach. Especially appreciate the learning agenda, posture of seeking guidance from Advisory Committee, and use of a meeting facilitator	4	8	Page 19: Provides the services that they will offer Advisory Committee but not specifics on meeting plans (they provided this in the additional response but not in their NOI). Provides plenty of examples on how they will train the Advisory Committee but thin on how they will learn from the Committee
Partnership Personnel & Collaboration Subtotal (Total 20 points)		20			18	
Data Use & Protection, Research Methods						
<i>Expertise in Security (Max 5 points, x2 multiplier)</i>	5	10	Page 24: Describes expertise in cleaning, storing, collecting, using data.	5	10	Page 21: Provides description of expertise cleaning, collecting, storing, using data. I don't have expertise in this area, so I'm relying on Sam's assessment that Urban's application was slightly weaker
<i>Data Management & Security Plan* (Max 5 points, x2 multiplier)</i>	5	10	Page 24: Provides detailed Data Management and Security Plan. I defer to Sam saying that GW has a slight edge in their initial application	4	8	Page 22: Submitted Data Management and Security Plan. I don't have expertise in this area, so I defer to Sam who said that Urban's plan was slightly weaker. I don't think this difference is worth 4 points less, so I changed the scoring method slightly to only take off 2 points
Data Use & Protection, Research Methods Subtotal (Total 20 points)		20			18	
Research Methods						
<i>Validity & Data Quality (Max 5 points, x2 multiplier)</i>	4	8	Page 25: Strong application, but the quality control procedures are less detailed than what Urban provided	5	10	Page 25: Greater detail on quality assurance procedures. Urban would apply same standards across all consortium members
<i>Accountability & Transparency (Max 5 points)</i>	4	4	Page 25: Strong application, but the pre-specification/pre-registration issues that Sam, Rebecca, and Jenn raised have convinced me that their application is weaker on this front	5	5	Page 25: Urban's pre-specification/pre-registration response provides some assurance that the data will guide interpretations, not using the desired interpretations to guide how the data analysis is conducted & make agencies more accepting of unexpected results
Research Methods Subtotal (Total 15 points)		12			15	
Financial Management & Proposed Budget						
<i>Financial Management & Proposed Budget* (Max 5 points, x3 multiplier)</i>	5	15	Page 26: describes financial management, internal accounting procedures, sources of funding, proposed budget, and institutional support. Showed willingness to adjust plans and increasing Consortium's contribution with COVID's new budgetary realities	5	15	Page 27: Provides detailed financial management plan, internal accounting procedures, funding sources, institutional support. I have philosophical qualms with their view that foundation money = independent but taxpayer money does not, but this is more a matter of personal preferences than something that the scoring should take into account
Financial Management & Proposed Budget Subtotal (Total 15 points)		15			15	
Total Score		95			94	