

Request for Qualification: Evidence-Based Interventions for School Improvement and Continuous Improvement

Application Scoring Rubric

<p>Notes on Scoring: Supplied evidence was scored by two expertly trained educational researchers and evaluators at UNLV using this rubric. NDE will notify providers regarding the results of their RFQ submission. UNLV will consistently check the interrater reliability of its trained application evaluators.</p>	
<p>Recommendation: Supplier is recommended for: ESSA Level 3- Promising Evidence for Accelerated School Turnaround model ESSA Level 4- Demonstrates a Rationale for Instructional Leadership Institute ESSA Level 3- Promising Evidence for Formative Assessment with LSI Student Evidence Tracker Plus (SET+) ESSA Level 4- Demonstrates a Rationale for Metrics-Based Monitoring & Support System:</p>	
<p>Organization Name: Learning Sciences International, LLC (LSI)</p>	<p>Global Notes:</p> <p>The supplier applied at Level 2- Moderate Evidence.</p> <p>Learning Sciences International (LSI) applied for a review of their portfolio of partnership model services, including 1) Accelerated School Turnaround, 2) Instructional Leadership Institute, 3) Formative Assessment with Student Evidence Tracker Plus, and 4) Metrics-Based Monitoring and Support System. Accelerated School Turnaround partnerships “are an intensive, two-year partnership that offers a continuum of supports to build capacity for sustainable improvement in two phases: Establishing Supportive Conditions for Learning and Transformation of Core Instruction.” The Instructional Leadership Institute is a 4-day institute designed to “create a culture of continuous improvement and build effective instructional leadership teams that thrive in even the most challenging environments.” The Student Evidence Tracker Plus (SET+) “is a technology tool that provides teachers with an easy interface to input learning goals and the criteria to demonstrate meeting those learning goals.” Finally, the Metric-Driven Monitoring and Support System “builds leadership capacity across all levels of...schools—from the district office to the classroom.”</p>
<p>Intervention Name: Accelerated School Turnaround, Instructional Leadership Institute, Formative Assessment with LSI Student Evidence Tracker Plus (“SET+”), Metrics-Based Monitoring & Support System</p>	
<p>Intervention Category: School Leadership Development & Capacity Building</p> <p>Data-Driven Decision Making and Using Data to Inform Instruction</p>	
<p>Evidence Reference: (List all evidence referenced e.g. citations)</p> <p><u>Accelerated School Turnaround:</u></p> <p>Basileo, L. D., & Wolf, K. (2021). How a school partnering with LSI pre and post COVID-19 substantially outperformed its district learning rates. LSI Applied Research Center</p> <p><u>Instructional Leadership Institute:</u></p> <p>LSI Applied Research Center. (2021). Theoretical and empirical findings from research. LSI Applied Research Center.</p> <p>Wageman, R., Hackman, J. R., & Lehman, E. (2005). Team diagnostic survey. Development of an instrument. <i>Journal of Applied Behavioral Research</i>, 41(4), 373-398.</p>	

Eisele, P. (2013). Validation of the Team Diagnostic Survey and a field experiment to examine the effects of an Intervention to Increase team effectiveness. *Group Facilitation*, 12, 53-70.

Formative Assessment with LSI Student Evidence Tracker Plus (SET+):

Basileo, L. D. (2016). Can minute-to-minute formative assessment help predict how students will do on end-of-year testing? LSI Applied Research Center.

Metrics-Based Monitoring & Support System:

Basileo, L. D., & Lyons, M. E. (2019). The research base supporting the Rigor Diagnostic observation instrument. LSI Applied Research Center.

LSI provided six reports across the four partnership models. Each partnership model, and the provided pieces of evidence, need to be evaluated separately.

Accelerated School Turnaround:

The supplied report tracks a single LSI partnered school using the LSI Accelerated School Turnaround model during the COVID-19 pandemic. The report compares math and reading performance changes during 2020-21 for grades K-5 for the LSI partner school relative to the school district (and also to similar schools). Math in the LSI partner school was higher by 100% across all grades and reading increased by 142% (relative to the district). From 2019-20 to 2020-21, LSI partner schools increased Math performance by 48% and reading performance by 7% (whereas similar schools experienced a decline in both reading and math). Sufficient information is not provided in the report regarding the quality of the matched comparison group (in terms of baseline equivalency). For this reason, this evidence should be classified at Level 3- Correlational.

Instructional Leadership Institute:

LSI provided 3 pieces of evidence for their Instructional Leadership Institute. The first is a 2021 report from LSI that summarizes the research evidence that demonstrates the rationale for the Instructional Leadership Institute. As noted in the report itself, this evidence qualifies under ESSA Level 4- Demonstrates a Rationale.

The second piece of evidence validates the Team Diagnostic Survey (TDS) as a way to measure the strengths and weaknesses of any team. This evidence suggests that the TDS (which is taken as part of the Instructional Leadership Institute) is a valid and reliable measure; however, this study does not evaluate the institute itself.

The final piece of evidence provides further evidence of the validity of the TDS and its

effectiveness as a feedback tool. However, again, this is not a direct evaluation of the Instructional Leadership Institute. For this reason, this evidence must be classified as ESSA Level 4- Demonstrates a Rationale.

Formative Assessment with LSI Student Evidence Tracker Plus (SET+):

The supplied evidence is an LSI report on a study conducted throughout the 2015-16 school year in a Florida elementary school that used the LSI tracker. The LSI tracker collects student evidence during instruction to “determine whether students had met standards-based criteria on each performance assessment (p. 3).” The study demonstrates that the tracker score significantly predicts student achievement on the end-of-the-year assessment, even after controlling for student characteristics. The supplied evidence fits the definition of ESSA Level 3- Promising Evidence.

Metrics-Based Monitoring & Support System:

The final piece of evidence summarizes the research evidence that demonstrates the rationale for the Metrics-Based Monitoring and Support system. This evidence qualifies under ESSA Level 4- Demonstrates a Rationale.

Other Evidence:

The strongest piece of evidence that LSI supplied is a report that documents the efficacy of LSI’s Schools for Rigor (SFR) in Des Moines Public Schools. The report uses propensity score matching to compare math and reading scores for SFR students relative to a matched comparison group (which would qualify at ESSA Level 2). However, this report does not clearly indicate whether the aforementioned portfolio partnership services (e.g., Accelerated School Turnaround) were provided or whether Schools for Rigor was something entirely different. Therefore, it is unclear how this piece of evidence should be used to inform the efficacy of LSI’s Accelerated School Turnaround, Instructional Leadership Institute, Formative Assessment with LSI Student Evidence

Tracker Plus (“SET+”), Metrics-Based Monitoring & Support System interventions.

Evidence Level Proposed	Meets Evidence Standards	Meets Evidence Standards With Reservations	Does Not Meet Evidence Standards	Notes:
<i>Tier 1- Strong Evidence (Randomized Controlled Trials)</i>				
Does the study use random assignment?				
Does the study have low levels of overall and differential attrition?				
If yes, does the study have baseline equivalence?				
If no, does the study perform any type of statistical adjustment?				
Does the study show a statistically significant, positive (i.e., favorable), and meaningful effect of the intervention on a student outcome or other relevant outcome?				
Is the study not overridden by statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) evidence on the same intervention in other studies that meet <i>WWC Evidence Standards with or without reservations</i> or are the equivalent quality for making causal inferences?				

Does the study have a large sample (i.e., 350 single analysis units or 50 or more groups that contain 10 or more single analysis units) and a multi-site sample (i.e., more than one site)?				
Does the study have a sample that overlaps with the populations (i.e., the types of students served) AND settings (e.g., rural, urban) proposed to receive the intervention?				
<i>Tier 2- Moderate Evidence (Quasi-Experimental Designs)</i>				
Does study using comparison groups that are baseline equivalent?				
Does the study have low levels of attrition?				
If no, do the two groups have equivalent post-attrition?				
If no, is the attrition considered random?				
Does the study rule out potential intervention contamination? (i.e. contemporaneous events)				
Does the study show a statistically significant, positive (i.e., favorable), and meaningful effect of the intervention on a student outcome or other relevant outcome?				
Is the study not overridden by statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) evidence on the same intervention in other studies that meet <i>WWC Evidence Standards with or without reservations</i> or are the equivalent quality for making causal inferences?				
Does the study have a large sample and a multi-site sample?				
<i>Tier 3- Promising Evidence (Correlational Studies)</i>				
Does the study attempt to correct for differences between treatment and comparison groups?	X			
Does the study show a statistically significant, positive (i.e., favorable), and meaningful effect of the intervention on a student outcome or other relevant outcome?	X			
Is the study not overridden by statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) evidence on the same intervention in other studies that meet <i>WWC Evidence Standards with or without reservations</i> or are the equivalent quality for making causal inferences?	X			
<i>Tier 4- Demonstrates a Rationale</i>				

<p>Does the study/intervention have a well-specified logic model (a.k.a., a theory of action / conceptual framework that identifies key components of the proposed process, product, strategy, or practice which often includes the inputs, outputs, and outcomes/impact) that is informed by research or an evaluation that suggests how the intervention is likely to improve relevant outcomes?</p>	<p>X</p>			
<p>Does the intervention include an effort to study the effects of the intervention, ideally producing promising evidence or higher, that will happen as part of the intervention or is underway elsewhere (e.g., this could mean another SEA, LEA, or research organization is studying the intervention elsewhere), to inform stakeholders about the success of that intervention?</p>	<p>X</p>			