

## 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
<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	
Initial Screening						
	Your Review		Your Review		Your Review	
<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?				YES		YES
<b>Timely Submission:</b> Was the application submitted on time?	YES			YES		YES
<b>Period of Commitment:</b> Does the application commit to the 10 year partnership commitment?	NO			YES		YES
<b>Background Information:</b> Does the application include an executive summary, mission/history, and consortium?	NO			YES		YES
Scoring						
	Your Score	Total Score	Comments	Your Score	Total Score	Comments
<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	EE has conducted extensive education research in urban districts and includes an understanding of those most impacted by research and decision making and includes a Plan for Equity to help ensure these issues are consistently addressed. In addition, the research expertise matrix demonstrates expertise across many relevant areas.
<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	the collaborative has conducted extensive education research in urban districts. However, the proposal lacked a vision for understanding and collaborating in urban jurisdictions in particular - what is unique about doing research in urban settings? what responsibility does that entail? for example, there was not vision for how disenfranchisement, racial, or socioeconomic inequality, for example, plays a role in this work.
<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	Clear plan and understanding of core RPP principles and really appreciate how the structure will ensure that these principles are applied or adopted equally by all partners using the stewardship group. Also a good understanding that researchers need to learn too and may not be experts in partnership work - a very common stumbling block for early RPPs, this will still happen but they know in advance and have a structure to help. Finally, good discussion of mutual benefits and capacity building and what it means for products to be built in collaboration but maintain independence and be credible - this is a tricky concept for new RPPs and they seem to understand that balance.
<b>Knowledge &amp; Expertise Subtotal (Total 30 points)</b>	8	8		24	24	The collaborative stated multiple RPP principles but lacked a core understanding of how these principles fundamentally change the research model. One outcome of this is that there was no mention of the fact that researchers will not be inherently good at RPP work simply because they have conducted lots of research before. What training, support or capacity building do they anticipate for the researchers? Similarly, how does Urban ensure that core RPP principles are shared by all the researchers in all 15 organizations? There didn't seem to be a logic model supporting this shift in roles and responsibilities inherent in partnership work.
<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	solid plan and many key spots filled - most imp the exec director and a stewardship group which is in addition to RPP advisors
<i>Advisory Committee Collaboration (Max 5 points, x2 multiplier)</i>	1	2	not clear they know what the advisory committee role is	5	10	good understanding of how to work with a diverse group to reach consensus and the timeline and steps involved with bringing this group together and the exact work they will need to be doing - lots of details
<b>Partnership Personnel &amp; Collaboration Subtotal (Total 20 points)</b>	2	2		18	18	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 work - as per 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 research agenda with this type of board?
<b>Data Use &amp; Protection, Research Methods</b>						
<i>Expertise in Security (Max 5 points, x2 multiplier)</i>	1	2		4	8	seems good - like the centralized secure management which seems better for collaboration and less transfer of data. Ultimate decision making points they leave up to OSSE / LEAs which makes sense
<i>Data Management &amp; Security Plan* (Max 5 points, x2 multiplier)</i>	0	0		5	10	specific talk of metadata and data inventories which is very useful. This represents major work for the first year of every RPP - as cited in Wertworth recent paper - says takes one year, for example
<b>Data Use &amp; Protection, Research Methods Subtotal (Total 20 points)</b>	2	2		18	18	seems fine. Some centralized cloud based secure storage could be more useful for a collab with 15 partners than having to always send RPP as transfers are a weak link in security - plus leads to version control issues
<b>Research Methods</b>						
<i>Validity &amp; Data Quality (5 points, x2 multiplier)</i>	0	0	insufficient quant / data experience or articulation	4	8	involved which is useful
<i>Accountability &amp; Transparency (Max 5 points)</i>	1	1		4	4	good vision for accountability and transparency and likely consistency across members due to prior RPP work, but could use more evidence to support
<b>Research Methods Subtotal (Total 15 points)</b>	1	1		12	12	some partners have better accountability transparency than others, same as above
<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	more specific budget and institutional commitments
<b>Financial Management &amp; Proposed Budget Subtotal (Total 15 points)</b>	3	3		15	15	seems ok, not too detailed or hard to better assess
<b>Total Score</b>	16	16		87	87	