CCNETWORK
Comprehensive Center Network

REGION 7
Alabama
Florida
Mississippi

Research Study Review Rubric

The rubric below is based on _Evidence for Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Standards and Procedures_ to identify research study evidence of program and practice effectiveness, meeting ESSA levels of evidence standards. Locate relevant research studies for review and hyperlink them to the rubric's Research Study headings.

Math Review Rubric

MATH RUBRIC: _Studies on _____ Program_	Research Study 1 Name and hyperlink	Research Study 2 Name and hyperlink	Research Study 3 Name and hyperlink
SCREENING: _Is this study one that should be reviewed?_	Place a check (√) where applies.		
Program/study has been reviewed by the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC)? For example: WWC Practice Guide, WWC Intervention Report, WWC Single study review, etc. (I_f Yes, then skip to "STUDY OUTCOMES" at the end_)	__ Yes __ No	__ Yes __ No	__ Yes __ No
Program has been reviewed in Evidence for ESSA? (I_f Yes, then skip to "STUDY OUTCOMES" at the end_)	__ Yes __ No	__ Yes __ No	__ Yes __ No
Program Match: The program, as submitted for consideration, is the same as the program used in the study AND was implemented exactly as it is intended to be implemented in non-study classrooms and schools _(If No, do not continue)_	__ Yes __ No	__ Yes __ No	__ Yes __ No
Reported Outcomes: Select the measure _(If a measure of general math achievement is not included, do not continue)_	__ General Math Achievement __ Other outcomes (describe)	__ General Math Achievement __ Other outcome (describe)	__ General Math Achievement __ Other outcomes (describe)
STUDY CHARACTERISTICS: _Well-designed, well-implemented_	Place a check (√) where applies. If **No** is chosen, do not continue.		
Dependent Variable(s): Includes quanittative measure of math academic achievement. Test developers were not involved in the study.	__ Yes __ No	__ Yes __ No	__ Yes __ No
Research Recency: 2000 to present	__ Yes __ No	__ Yes __ No	__ Yes __ No
Experimental Design: • RCT or QE • Correlational	__ RCT or __ QE __ Correlational	__ RCT or __ QE __ Correlational	__ RCT or __ QE __ Correlational
Pre-test Data (to establish initial equivalence): Study establishes baseline and post-assessment outcome measures and notes differences.	__ Yes __ No	__ Yes __ No	__ Yes __ No

Research Study Review Rubric

MATH RUBRIC: *Studies on _____ Program*	Research Study 1 Name and hyperlink	Research Study 2 Name and hyperlink	Research Study 3 Name and hyperlink
STUDY CHARACTERISTICS: *Well-designed, well-implemented*	Place a check (√) where applies. If *No* is chosen, do not continue.		
Free of confounding factors: Studies must not have any confounding factors that are perfectly aligned with group assignment. ($\geq$ 2 teachers and per condition and $\geq$ 30 students per condition)	__ Yes (free of confounds) __ No	__ Yes (free of confounds) __ No	__ Yes (free of confounds) __ No
Large Sample Size: • n $\geq$ 350 study participants with $\geq$ 2 teachers • $\geq$ 2 schools	#__ students #__ teachers #__ schools	#__ students #__ teachers #__ schools	#__ students #__ teachers #__ schools
Sample Overlap: RCT and QE study sample characteristics overlap by: • Populations (i.e., types of students served) • Settings (i.e., rural, urban)	__ Yes __ No	__ Yes __ No	__ Yes __ No
Attrition: To sustain similar experimental and control groups, differential attrition is $\leq$ 15% Differential attrition = |Treatment attrition – Control attrition| Treatment attrition = (Treatment $_{baseline}$ – Treatment $_{final}$) / Treatment $_{baseline}$ Control attrition = (Control $_{baseline}$ – Control $_{final}$) / Control $_{baseline}$	__ Yes (low attrition) __ No (high attrition)	__ Yes (low attrition) __ No (high attrition)	__ Yes (low attrition) __ No (high attrition)
STUDY OUTCOMES: *Statistically significant effect*	Place a check (√) where applies. If *No* is chosen, do not continue.		
Study reported finding: Study/evaluation reports a statistically significant positive outcome in favor of the treatment group on at least the general math achievement outcome.	__ Yes __ No	__ Yes __ No	__ Yes __ No

Levels of Evidence: *Demonstrates Causality or Correlation*
• **STRONG:** $\geq$ 1 qualifying RCT study w/ statistically significant positive effects on general math achievement outcome measures.
• **MODERATE:** $\geq$ 1 qualifying QE study w/ significantly positive effects on general math achievement outcome measures.
• **PROMISING:** $\geq$ 1 study w/ significantly positive effects on general math achievement outcome measures without any statistically significant *negative* effects. Study could be:
  o Correlational study with controls for inputs/bias, or
  o RCT or QE study that would have qualified as STRONG or MODERATE except for one design or implementation issue (per ESSA/WWC standards).
	__ Strong __ Moderate __ Promising	__ Strong __ Moderate __ Promising	__ Strong __ Moderate __ Promising

Evidence Summary:

English Language Arts Review Rubric

ELA RUBRIC: *Studies on _____ Program*	Research Study 1 Name and hyperlink	Research Study 2 Name and hyperlink	Research Study 3 Name and hyperlink
SCREENING: *Is this study one that should be reviewed?*	Place a check (√) where applies.		
Program/study has been reviewed by the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC)? For example: WWC Practice Guide, WWC Intervention Report, WWC Single study review, etc. (I*f Yes, then skip to "STUDY OUTCOMES" at the end*)	__ Yes __ No	__ Yes __ No	__ Yes __ No
Program has been reviewed in Evidence for Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)? (I*f Yes, then skip to "STUDY OUTCOMES" at the end*)	__ Yes __ No	__ Yes __ No	__ Yes __ No
Program Match: The program, as submitted for consideration, is the same as the program used in the study AND was implemented exactly as it is intended to be implemented in non-study classrooms and schools *(If No, do not continue)*	__ Yes __ No	__ Yes __ No	__ Yes __ No
Reported Outcomes: Select the measure *(If a measure of reading achievement, aligned with the intent of the intervention is not included, do not continue. For example, if the intervention targets vocabulary, and there is not a measure of vocabulary or general reading achievement, do not continue.)*	__ General Reading Achievement __ Phonological / Phonemic Awareness __ Phonics __ Fluency __ Vocabulary __ Comprehension __ Oral Language __ Other outcomes (describe)	__ General Reading Achievement __ Phonological / Phonemic Awareness __ Phonics __ Fluency __ Vocabulary __ Comprehension __ Oral Language __ Other outcomes (describe)	__ General Reading Achievement __ Phonological / Phonemic Awareness __ Phonics __ Fluency __ Vocabulary __ Comprehension __ Oral Language __ Other outcomes (describe)
STUDY CHARACTERISTICS: *Well-designed, well-implemented*	Place a check (√) where applies. If *No* is chosen, do not continue.		
Dependent Variable(s): Includes quantitative measure of reading academic achievement (see reported outcomes above). Test developers were not involved in the study.	__ Yes __ No	__ Yes __ No	__ Yes __ No
Research Recency: 2000 to present	__ Yes __ No	__ Yes __ No	__ Yes __ No
Experimental Design: • RCT or QE • Correlational	__ RCT or __ QE __ Correlational	__ RCT or __ QE __ Correlational	__ RCT or __ QE __ Correlational

Research Study Review Rubric

ELA RUBRIC: *Studies on _____ Program*	Research Study 1 Name and hyperlink	Research Study 2 Name and hyperlink	Research Study 3 Name and hyperlink
STUDY CHARACTERISTICS: *Well-designed, well-implemented*	Place a check (v) where applies. If *No* is chosen, do not continue.		
Pre-test Data (to establish initial equivalence): Study establishes baseline and post-assessment outcome measures and notes differences.	__ Yes __ No	__ Yes __ No	__ Yes __ No
Free of confounding factors: Studies must not have any confounding factors that are perfectly aligned with group assignment. ($\geq$ 2 teachers and per condition and $\geq$ 30 students per condition)	__ Yes (free of confounds) __ No	__ Yes (free of confounds) __ No	__ Yes (free of confounds) __ No
Large Sample Size: • n $\geq$ 350 study participants with $\geq$ 2 teachers • $\geq$ 2 schools	#__ students #__ teachers #__ schools	#__ students #__ teachers #__ schools	#__ students #__ teachers #__ schools
Sample Overlap: RCT and QE study sample characteristics overlap by: • Populations (i.e., types of students served) • Settings (i.e., rural, urban)	__ Yes __ No	__ Yes __ No	__ Yes __ No
Attrition: To sustain similar experimental and control groups, differential attrition is $\leq$ 15% Differential attrition = |Treatment attrition – Control attrition| Treatment attrition = (Treatment $_{baseline}$ – Treatment $_{final}$) / Treatment $_{baseline}$ Control attrition = (Control $_{baseline}$ – Control $_{final}$) / Control $_{baseline}$	__ Yes (low attrition) __ No (high attrition)	__ Yes (low attrition) __ No (high attrition)	__ Yes (low attrition) __ No (high attrition)
STUDY OUTCOMES: *Statistically significant effect*	Place a check (v) where applies. If *No* is chosen, do not continue.		
Study reported finding: Study/evaluation reports a statistically significant positive outcome in favor of the treatment group on a reading measure aligned with the intention of the intervention (e.g., vocabulary intervention with statistically significant positive outcome in vocabulary outcome or overall reading achievement).	__ Yes __ No	__ Yes __ No	__ Yes __ No

Levels of Evidence: *Demonstrates Causality or Correlation*
• **STRONG:** $\geq$ 1 qualifying RCT study w/ statistically significant positive effects on aligned reading achievement outcome measures.
• **MODERATE:** $\geq$ 1 qualifying QE study w/ significantly positive effects on aligned reading achievement outcome measures.
• **PROMISING:** $\geq$ 1 study w/ significantly positive effects on aligned reading achievement outcome measures without any statistically significant *negative* effects. Study could be:
   o Correlational study with controls for inputs/bias, or
   o RCT or QE study that would have qualified as STRONG or MODERATE except for one design or implementation issue (per ESSA/WWC standards).
	__ Strong
	__ Moderate
	__ Promising
		__ Strong
		__ Moderate
		__ Promising
			__ Strong
			__ Moderate
			__ Promising

Evidence Summary: