

KIPP Chicago Instructional Technology Evaluation Rubric

This rubric is designed to help KIPP Chicago purchase instructional technology that best supports the learning of our students. These are guidelines and not requirements. Knowing the strengths and weaknesses of programs will allow school staff and regional staff to provide more targeted support. Regional staff can also provide this feedback to vendors to improve areas of weakness.

Please fill out sections designated for you and reach out with any questions.

Program Information (School Leader fills out)

Program Name:

Company Contact:

Subject Area(s):

Grade(s) it will be used:

How will this program be implemented into instruction? (What model will be used? Which teachers will implement it? Where does it fit in the schedule? What support will teachers get?)

--

What are the pain points that you expect that this program will solve? How will the implementation be assessed?

--

Do you wish to use this program to replace a program currently in use. If so, which program would you like to substitute and why is this program a stronger program?

--

	Does Not Meet (0)	Partially Meets (1-2)	Meets/Exceeds (3-4)
Content Coverage	*Program does not provide 100 hours of content / subject / grade	*Program provides at least 100 hours of content / subject / grade *Program covers some ability levels of students	*Program provides at least 100 hours of content / subject / grade *Covers most/all ability levels of students
Standards Alignment	*Content is not aligned to grade-level standards *Content aligned to non-Common Core grade-level standards	*Content aligned to Common Core grade level standards, but not at a micro-standard level of granularity	*Content aligned to Common Core grade-level standards at the micro-standard level *Program can provide % of Common Core standards covered
Assessments	*Program does not assign pre/post assessments	*Program assigns periodic pre/post assessments	*Program assigns pre/post assessments for units or objectives
Adaptivity	*Program is purely sequential , no adjustment of content based on individualized student level *Program can provide singular pre-test prior to student starting in the program which will determine that student's scope and sequence	*Program utilizes periodic diagnostic tests (2-5 per year) that will determine which individual lessons/activities a student needs to complete for a given unit *Program adapts content backward for struggling student	*Program utilizes diagnostics tests frequently prior to each unit or objective *Program adapts content backward for struggling students and adapts forward for students who demonstrate mastery of a given topic
Assignability	*Admin cannot influence student content whatsoever	*Admin can assign individual lessons/activities , but can only do so manually and for single lessons/activities	*Admin can re-order the content's scope and sequence at the standard or microstandard level
Teacher Role	*Program cannot work unless an adult is present to help the student	*Embedded program support students so some teacher intervention needed	*Embedded program support allows for little to no teacher intervention needed

	Does Not Meet (0)	Partially Meets (1-2)	Meets/Exceeds (3-4)
Data Reports	*No administrative data view	*Data dashboard provides reports but teachers must generate their own next steps *Students get data feedback after activities but cannot access data at all times	*Data dashboard provides clear next steps for teachers for both behavior and standards *Students have access to their data
Pedagogy	*Program only employs written instructions to teach concepts * No use of audio for instructions (if program for K-2) and	*Program utilizes some visual manipulatives to teach concepts *Uses audio for instructions (if program for K-2)	*Program utilizes audio, written instructions, and multiple visual manipulatives to teach concepts *When students struggle, a different pedagogical approach is employed to help students master concept
Engagement	*Program contains no engagement mechanisms to keep students motivated	*Program contains some engagment mechaniscms (video, educational games, personalization) *Engagment mechanisms exist, but are not tied to student performance	* Multiple engagement mechanisms exist and are tied to student performance *Students cannot utilize games/rewards unless earned through performance and diligence within program
Cost	*Cost exceeds \$50 per student for core program, \$25 for addressable practice, or \$15 for fact fluency or individual skill	*Cost under \$50 for core program, under \$25 for addressable practice, and under \$15 for fact fluency or individual skill, but cost still exceeds ideal price range	*Cost within \$15-30 for core program, \$10-15 for addressable practice, \$5-10 for fluency or individual skill
Support	*Need for multiple training sessions *No training/PD resources available online *Training exceeds 4 hours	*Some training/PD resources available online *Training between 2-4 hours * Help line available	*All training/PD resources available online *Training under 2 hours * Dedicated support person available
API and Data Integration	*Vendor cannot/unwilling to adopt KIPP Chicago Teacher integration with Edivant and Clever	*Vendor able/willing to adopt some aspects of integration (single user sign-on, automated account provisioning, and data integration) with Edivant and Clever	*Vendor able/willing to adopt all aspects of integration (single user sign-on, automated account provisioning, and data integration) with Edivant and Clever

	Does Not Meet (0)	Partially Meets (1-2)	Meets/Exceeds (3-4)
References	*Negative reviews from multiple networks	*Mix of positive and negative reviews *New program or company	*Mostly positive reviews *Strong reviews from schools that have similar instructional technology models

Program Evaluation

Program:

Subject:

Highest Priorities	Meets this criteria	Notes
*Must be either <u>adaptive</u> / <u>assignable</u> content (ideally both)		
For middle schools: Browser based and no local server		
Able to serve 120 simultaneous users over standard 1Mbps connection		
System tracks individual student progress by:		
Lessons complete		
% mastery of standards		
Accuracy		
Time on task		
System continues to provide other lessons once student has completed an assigned lesson/standard		
No additional materials/manipulatives required		
Students can work independently without the oversight of a credentialed teacher		
Addresses a key need for KIPP Chicago Schools students		

Weighted Decision Criteria Items (see "Rubric Descriptions" sheet)	Weighting	Does not Meet	Partially Meets	Meets/ Exceeds	Weighted Score	Notes
		0	(1-2)	(3-4)		
Content Coverage	5				0	
Standards Alignment	4				0	
Assessments	4				0	
Adaptivity	4				0	
Assignability	4				0	
Teacher Role	4				0	
Data Reports	4				0	

Pedagogy	3				0	
Engagement	3				0	
Cost	3				0	
Support	2				0	
API and Data Integration	2				0	
References from KIPP Networks and/or Similar Networks	3				0	

Total Pre-Screen Score (Max 180)

0

Verify During Trial (see also: "Rubric Descriptions" on next sheet)	Weighting	Does not Meet	Partially Meets	Meets/ Exceeds	Weighted Score	Notes
		0	(1-2)	(3-4)		
* <u>Assessment</u> and Results- student make significant gains as determined by	5				0	
*Confirmation of <u>Adaptivity</u> - system modifies lessons in real time based on student error and alters content to adapt to student's individual level	4				0	
*Confirmation of <u>Assignability</u> - system allows user to assign content and alter scope and sequence at micro-standard level	5				0	
Student Usability- ease of student navigation and comprehension of instru	4				0	
Admin Oversight- simplicity for coordinators to administer program and as	3				0	
Engagement/Breadth- curriculum could be used conitnuously without bur	4				0	
Confirmation of student independence- students should be able to use thi	4				0	
Support - phone/email access to responsive, respectful, effective support	3				0	

Total Trial Verification Score (Max 128)

0

Other notes: