

## Scoring Rubric for Innovation Research Zones Pilot Program Application

July 20, 2018 Version 1

**Project Name:** Reviewer #:

**School Districts, Charter School(s) and Partnering Organization:**

Application Area	Possible Points	Points after Independent Review	Points After Discussion
Hypothesis	12		
Research Design	20		
Emerging Practices	20		
Goals and Alignment with WBWF	12		
Instructional Staff	12		
Evaluation	12		
Timeline	12		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100</b>		

<b>HYPOTHESIS: 12 POINTS</b>	<b>Exemplary 10-12</b>	<b>Good 7-9</b>	<b>Satisfactory 4-6</b>	<b>Developing 1-3</b>
<b>My Score</b>	<p>Proposed hypothesis is a new and innovative idea, and is also likely to produce an impact on the local educational landscape.</p> <p>Proposed hypothesis is logical, well thought out, and based in existing research. The proposed intervention is actually likely to impact outcomes as proposed. The applicant provides procedures to try out the new idea and a plan for measurement of success.</p> <p>The hypothesis should show a logical (construct validity) and research-based defense (rigor) of why the proposed project will lead to outcomes, along with measurement of outcomes. It should also describe how expected results will lead to improved World’s Best Workforce outcomes.</p> <p>The applicant describes exactly who their target populations is. They also describe plans for the organization, such as changes to internal structures, operations, or needs for additional staffing and support, and resources.</p>	<p>The hypothesis is an idea in education that goes beyond continuous improvement.</p> <p>The applicant provides procedures to try out the new idea and a plan for measurement of success.</p> <p>The applicant describes exactly their target population(s), what outcomes they are aiming for and how these outcomes will be measured. They also describe plans for the organization, such as changes to internal structures, operations, or needs for additional staffing and support. A plan for research is provided along with resources.</p>	<p>Hypothesis is articulated with limited detail but proposed outcomes are described. Target population(s) are briefly described.</p> <p>Incomplete information is provided relating to one of the following: target population, proposed outcomes, measuring outcomes, plans for organizational change, research plan or resources. The gap in information creates doubt as to the effectiveness of the overall plan.</p>	<p>Hypothesis is incompletely described or not new. There are significant gaps in the logic that make it difficult to determine if proposed outcomes are likely to be met.</p> <p>Incomplete information is provided relating to two or more of the following: target population, proposed outcomes, measuring outcomes, plans for organizational change, research plan or resources. The gap in information leads to a plan that appears only partially developed.</p>

**REVIEWER NOTES HYPOTHESIS:**

<b>RESEARCH DESIGN: 20 POINTS</b>	<b>Exemplary 16-20</b>	<b>Good 11-15</b>	<b>Satisfactory 6-10</b>	<b>Developing 1-5</b>
<b>My Score</b>	<p>Research questions for the innovation work are clearly stated with hypotheses that have clear outcomes. The relationship between the hypothesis and outcomes is clear and likely.</p> <p>Detailed description of the number and demographics of participants to be studied, outcome measures to be used, data to be collected, and statistical analysis are presented.</p> <p>A strong research design is clearly articulated with specification of comparison groups and pre-post analyses. Full points will be earned for quasi-experimental designs where student growth or improvement is measured with reliable and valid tools, and comparison groups are matched to intervention groups.</p> <p>Clearly discusses how the research will contribute to the district's work on the issue or problem addressed by the innovation. Includes a discussion of how partners participated in the design of the research study.</p>	<p>Research questions with hypothesis that have related outcomes are provided. Relationship of hypothesis to outcomes is clear.</p> <p>Basic information provided on all of the following: participants, outcomes, data and statistical analysis. Details may be provided in some areas but are lacking in others.</p> <p>Research design includes the following elements: pre-post analyses, comparison groups and measurement tools. All elements are appropriate for task and well designed, however, one or more is lacking a sufficient level of detail.</p> <p>Discusses contribution of research to district's work in sufficient detail; notes participation of partners with limited detail.</p>	<p>Research questions are stated; hypothesis has some outcomes. Relationships between hypothesis and some outcomes are somewhat unclear.</p> <p>Information is missing in one or two of the following areas: participants, outcomes, data and statistical analysis; lack should not hinder project implementation.</p> <p>Research design includes a basic description of the following elements: pre-post analyses, comparison groups and measurement tools. One or more elements is inappropriate or has flaws in design.</p> <p>Discusses contribution of research to districts' work but lacks detail or relationship between research, and work is unclear; identifies partner without describing participation.</p>	<p>Research questions are not clearly stated, and the hypothesis does not have clear outcomes.</p> <p>Limited description of participants, outcomes data and statistical analyses. Likelihood of project implementation unclear from information provided.</p> <p>Research design is not well-developed and lacks pre-post analyses. Comparison groups and/or measurement tools may be poorly designed or inappropriate for task.</p> <p>Limited discussion of how the research relates to district's work. Lacks any discussion of partners.</p>

**RESEARCH REVIEWER NOTES:**

<b>EMERGING PRACTICES—20</b>	<b>Exemplary 16-20</b>	<b>Good 11-15</b>	<b>Satisfactory 6-10</b>	<b>Developing 1-5</b>
<b>My Score</b>	<p>Emerging practices are articulated clearly, research- based, and explained in relation to one another. Program goals are described in detail, aligned with the SMART goal format, and connected to needs informed by data.</p> <p>Research-based emerging practices and desired student and school outcomes are clearly connected to all World's Best Workforce requirements under Minnesota Statutes, section 120B.11.</p> <p>Expected outcomes and graduation standards are described in detail and clearly connected to emerging practices.</p>	<p>Emerging practices are articulated clearly and explained in relation to one another.</p> <p>Program goals are described in detail and aligned with the SMART goal format.</p> <p>Emerging practices and desired student and school outcomes are clearly connected to all World's Best Workforce requirements under Minnesota Statutes, section 120B.11.</p> <p>Expected outcomes and graduation standards are described and connected to emerging practices.</p>	<p>Emerging practices are listed but connections between them are not made.</p> <p>Program goals are described, but SMART goal elements are incomplete or unclear.</p> <p>Emerging practices and desired student or school outcomes are connected to most World's Best Workforce requirements under Minnesota Statutes, section 120B.11.</p> <p>Expected outcomes and graduation standards are described.</p>	<p>Practices listed are commonly used, not emerging, and not explained in relation to one another.</p> <p>Program goals are incomplete. SMART goal format is not followed.</p> <p>Emerging practices and desired student or school outcomes are connected to few or none of the World's Best Workforce requirements under Minnesota Statutes, section 120B.11.</p> <p>Expected outcomes and graduation standards are referenced, but may be unclear or need additional description.</p>

**EMERGING PRACTICES REVIEWER NOTES:**

<b>GOALS, OBJECTIVES, WBWF EDUCATION OUTCOMES: 12 POINTS</b>	<b>Exemplary 10-12</b>	<b>Good 7-9</b>	<b>Satisfactory 4-6</b>	<b>Developing 1-3</b>
<b>My Score</b>	<p>Clear, detailed description of goals, objectives and expected outcomes uses SMART goal format.</p> <p>Clearly identifies, using data, how project will improve student outcomes consistent with WBWF goals (120B.11) appropriate for students served.</p> <p>Description of expected outcomes and graduation standards is clear and well-defined.</p>	<p>Description of goals, objectives and expected outcomes is mostly complete and uses SMART goal format.</p> <p>General discussion of anticipated student outcomes are consistent with WBWF goals.</p> <p>Description of expected outcomes and graduation standards are mostly complete.</p>	<p>Description of goals, objectives and expected outcomes are mostly complete. SMART goal format is used inconsistently.</p> <p>Includes general discussion of anticipated student outcomes. Some WBWF goals not addressed</p> <p>Description of expected outcomes and graduation standards contain some significant gaps.</p>	<p>List of goals, objectives and expected outcomes is provided. SMART goal format is not used.</p> <p>List of anticipated outcomes, lacks clear relationship to WBWF goals.</p> <p>List of expected outcomes and graduation standards are provided; but it is unclear how they will be achieved.</p>

**GOALS REVIEWER NOTES:**

<b>EXEMPTIONS: Zero Points</b>	<b>No exemptions needed</b>	<b>Exemptions are lawful and clearly needed. Please explain.</b>	<b>Exemptions are lawful but may not be needed. Please explain.</b>	<b>Exemptions not lawful. Please explain.</b>
--------------------------------	-----------------------------	--	---	---

**EXEMPTION REVIEWER NOTES:**

INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF: 12 POINTS	Exemplary 10-12	Good 7-9	Satisfactory 4-6	Developing 1-3
<b>My Score</b>	<p>Proposed project application reflects direct feedback and guidance from the school's entire instructional staff. Multiple perspectives are represented.</p> <p>Feedback from all teachers and other education staff from all affected school sites drive program planning and implementation. Plan represents a collective effort.</p> <p>Plan to evaluate results of the program and assess the validity of the hypothesis relies on direct feedback from all teachers and other educational staff.</p> <p>Plan to disseminate results of the program plan reflect transparency, allow for feedback, are timely, and are described in detail.</p>	<p>Proposed project application was developed in concert with, and reflects direct feedback from the school's entire instructional staff.</p> <p>Feedback from all teachers and other education staff from all affected school sites inform program planning and implementation.</p> <p>Plan to evaluate results of the program and assess the validity of the hypothesis includes feedback from all teachers and other educational staff.</p> <p>Plan to disseminate results of the program plan reflect transparency, are timely, and are described in detail.</p>	<p>Proposed project application was developed in concert with, and utilized feedback from a portion of the school's instructional staff.</p> <p>Feedback from some teachers and other education staff from some affected school sites inform program planning and implementation.</p> <p>Plan to evaluate results of the program and assess the validity of the hypothesis considers feedback from some teachers and other educational staff.</p> <p>Plan to disseminate results of the program plan reflect transparency and are described in detail.</p>	<p>Proposed project application was shared with the school's instructional staff.</p> <p>Few teachers and other education staff from affected school sites are included in the planning process and implementation.</p> <p>Plan to evaluate results of the program and assess the validity of the hypothesis includes few teachers and other educational staff.</p> <p>Plan to disseminate results of the program plan lack specificity.</p>

**INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF: REVIEWER NOTES**

<b>EVALUATION PLAN AND DISSEMINATION: 12 POINTS</b>	<b>Exemplary 10-12</b>	<b>Good 7-9</b>	<b>Satisfactory 4-6</b>	<b>Developing 1-3</b>
<b>My Score</b>	<p>The evaluator or evaluation organization is specified with a clear description of background and competencies of the evaluator(s). A strong proposal will list a person trained in research and methodology with a Masters or Ph.D. in statistics, measurement, or research methodology.</p> <p>A strong proposal will provide a detailed dissemination plan within the innovation zone and communicate with the general public the purpose, results and discussion of research findings.</p> <p>Two-way communication is included.</p>	<p>Evaluator (individual or organization) has the required skills and competencies and is described with detail, including extensive experience in research and methodology and evaluation of education programs.</p> <p>Dissemination plan describes intent to present findings but does not solicit discussion.</p> <p>Dissemination includes innovation zone and beyond.</p>	<p>Evaluator (individual or organization) has experience in research and methodology and evaluation of education programs.</p> <p>Dissemination plan includes innovation zone and beyond, but is lacking some details that explain purpose and intent of dissemination.</p>	<p>Evaluator (individual or organization) does not have sufficient experience in research and methodology.</p> <p>Dissemination plan is limited to innovation zone members.</p>

**EVALUATION AND DISSEMINATION: REVIEWER NOTES**

<b>TIMELINE: 12 Points</b>	<b>Exemplary 10-12</b>	<b>Good 7-9</b>	<b>Satisfactory 4-6</b>	<b>Developing 1-3</b>
<b>My Score:</b>	A strong proposal will provide a detailed timeline including data collection occasions, establishment of data bases, analysis of outcomes and publication of findings. Special attention should be paid to the collection of data on the fidelity of implementation of innovation(s). Contingency plans for likely complications are included.	Timeline is clear and complete but lacks some details on the collection of data related to the fidelity of implementation. Limited contingencies are included.	Timeline is mostly complete, but there are one or two gaps that should not hinder the implementation. Contingencies are lacking.	Timeline lacks detail and specificity.

**TIMELINE REVIEWER NOTES:**

**OTHER NOTES ON OVERALL STRENGTHS OR CONCERNS ON THIS INNOVATION RESEARCH ZONES PILOT PROGRAM APPLICATION:**