



Outcomes & Research Committee: First Review Research-Based

Categories	1	2	3	4	Score
Goals & Objectives	The submission has no goals or objectives indicated.	The submission has goals and objectives, but they are not clearly defined.	The submission is well thought out, but lacking some details on practice and target population.	The submission is well thought out and complete with details on practice and target population.	
Evaluation Plan	The submission does not include any evaluation plan or clear strategy for measuring the project's success.	The submission includes a basic evaluation plan, but it is vague or lacks key components, such as clear evaluation methods or measurable benchmarks.	The submission outlines a clear evaluation plan with defined evaluation methods and some measurable benchmarks, but could benefit from further detail or clarity in certain areas.	The submission presents a comprehensive, detailed evaluation plan, including clear evaluation methods, measurable benchmarks, and a feasible timeline, all well aligned with the project's goals.	
Documented Use in Early Childhood	The submission has not indicated documented use in early childhood settings.	The submission has indicated little documented use in early childhood settings.	The submission has indicated at least one relevant article showing research in early childhood settings.	The submission has indicated multiple articles showing relevant research in early childhood settings.	
Alignment with OK Clearinghouse Priorities	The submission has minimal or no alignment with the OK Clearinghouse goals and priorities.	The submission has some alignment with the OK Clearinghouse goals, but lacks clear connection to core priorities.	The submission is mostly aligned with the OK Clearinghouse goals, but some aspects are tangential or peripheral.	The submissions is clearly aligned with the strategic goals and objectives of the OK Clearinghouse, addressing a high-priority area.	
Impact on Field/Community	The results or outcomes have little to no potential impact on early childhood practice, policy, or the field.	The outcomes are somewhat relevant but have limited potential for broader impact in early childhood.	The results or outcomes have clear potential to influence early childhood practice, policy, or future research in early childhood.	The results or outcomes have significant potential to influence practice, policy, or future research in early childhood.	

Intended Outcomes for Children in Early Childhood Settings	The submission is not relevant to early childhood settings and does not specify any intended outcomes.	The submission has limited relevance to early childhood settings and does not clearly identify intended outcomes.	The submission is somewhat relevant to early childhood settings, though the intended outcomes are not fully articulated.	The submission is highly relevant to early childhood settings and provides a clear and well-defined set of intended outcomes.	
Practical Application	The submission faces significant feasibility concerns, including major issues with timeline, or resources, which make execution challenging or unlikely.	The submission is somewhat feasible but has notable gaps or uncertainties in timeline, or resource allocation that need addressing.	The submission is generally feasible, but may require minor adjustments in terms of timeline, or resources for successful execution.	The submission is clear and well-defined for successful execution, including a comprehensive consideration of timeline, and resources.	
Evidence for Research-Based					
	2	4	6	8	
Evidence for Research-Based (double-weighted)	The submission is based on unpublished research conducted by the developer, with limited or no external validation to support its effectiveness.	The submission is based on published, peer-reviewed research conducted by the developer, offering a solid foundation for its implementation.	Published research exists beyond the developer, providing credible evidence that supports the submission's effectiveness.	The submission is supported by a significant body of research, demonstrating strong evidence of effectiveness and impact.	



Process & Implementation Committee: First Review Practice-Based

Categories	1	2	3	4	Score
Promotion of Shared Access	The submission does not indicate a description or plan to ensure shared access to resources or services.	The submission indicates a minimal description or plan to ensure shared access to resources or services.	The submission indicates a plan describing a way to ensure shared access to resources and services.	The submission indicates a well described and clear plan to ensure shared access to resources and services.	
Program Goals and Structure	The program goals and components are unclear, overly broad, poorly defined, or missing key activities.	The program goals and components are somewhat vague and include limited details on activities.	The program goals and components are mostly clear but lack measurable elements and include some details on activities.	The program goals and components are clear, specific, and measurable. The program activities follow logical sequencing with clear roles and direct link to target population.	
Quality of Submission	The submission would benefit from further development and does not include information on the supports needed or available for implementation.	The submission lacks clear and detailed explanations regarding the supports required or available for implementation.	The submission is well thought out, but is still lacking some information on what supports are available or required to implement.	The submission is well thought out and contains comprehensive information regarding what supports are available or required to implement.	
Budget and Narrative	The budget and narrative are vague or insufficient.	The budget and narrative lack clarity, making it difficult to assess feasibility of implementation.	The budget and narrative are clearly defined, but may have some gaps or unrealistic assumptions.	The budget and narrative are clear and comprehensive in detail including realistic staffing and justifiable expenses ensuring successful program implementation.	
Replicability	The practice does not seem easily replicable by other practitioners and may require substantial modifications.	The practice may be replicable, but the lack of sufficient information or detail makes full replication challenging.	The practice is replicable by other practitioners, but may require some slight modifications and/or extra resources.	The practice has demonstrated clear replicability.	
Sustainability	The submission does not include evidence indicating sustainability beyond the initial implementation period and does not reference a plan to sustain implementation.	The submission includes some evidence indicating sustainability resources and/or capacity beyond the initial implementation period and briefly references a plan to sustain implementation.	The submission includes evidence indicating sustainability of resources and capacity beyond the initial implementation period and includes a plan to sustain implementation.	The submission includes clear evidence indicating sustainability of resources and capacity beyond the initial implementation period and includes a well defined plan to sustain implementation indefinitely.	

Scalability of the Program	The program is not designed for scalability, and there are no clear strategies for expanding or adapting it to other regions or contexts.	The program includes some considerations for scalability, but lacks clear strategies for expanding or adapting it to other regions or contexts.	The program is designed with scalability in mind, but the strategies for expanding or adapting it to other regions or contexts are underdeveloped.	The program is designed for statewide scalability and includes clear strategies for expanding or adapting it to other regions or contexts.	
Support for Practice-Based					
	2	4	6	8	
Support for Practice-Based (double-weighted)	Implementation of practice was vague and no additional supporting information was provided.	Implementation of practice was vague, with some additional supporting information or feedback provided.	Clear picture of how practice was implemented to produce outcomes and additional supporting information or feedback was provided.	Clear picture of how practice was implemented to produce outcomes and additional supporting information or feedback was provided.	



Outcomes & Research Committee: Second Review Practice-Based

Categories	1	2	3	4	Score
Goals & Objectives	The submission has no goals or objectives indicated.	The submission has goals and objectives, but they are not clearly defined.	The submission is well thought out, but lacking some details on practice and target population.	The submission is well thought out and complete with details on practice and target	
Evaluation Plan	The submission does not include any evaluation plan or clear strategy for measuring the project's success.	The submission includes a basic evaluation plan, but it is vague or lacks key components, such as clear evaluation methods or measurable benchmarks.	The submission outlines a clear evaluation plan with defined evaluation methods and some measurable benchmarks, but could benefit from further detail or clarity in certain areas.	The submission presents a comprehensive, detailed evaluation plan, including clear evaluation methods, measurable benchmarks, and a feasible timeline, all well aligned with the project's goals.	
Documented Use in Early Childhood	The submission has not indicated documented use in early childhood settings.	The submission has indicated little documented use in early childhood settings.	The submission has indicated at least one relevant article showing research in early childhood settings.	The submission has indicated multiple articles showing relevant research in early childhood settings.	
Alignment with OK Clearinghouse Priorities	The submission has minimal or no alignment with OK Clearinghouse goals and priorities.	The submission has some alignment with OK Clearinghouse goals, but lacks clear connection to core priorities.	The submission is mostly aligned with OK Clearinghouse goals, but some aspects are tangential or	The submissions is clearly aligned with the strategic goals and objectives of the OK Clearinghouse, addressing a high-	
Impact on Field/Community	The results or outcomes have little to no potential impact on early childhood practice, policy, or the field.	The outcomes are somewhat relevant but have limited potential for broader impact in early childhood.	The results or outcomes have clear potential to influence early childhood practice, policy, or future research in early	The results or outcomes have significant potential to influence practice, policy, or future research in early childhood.	

Intended Outcomes for Children in Early Childhood Settings	The submission is not relevant to early childhood settings and does not specify any intended outcomes.	The submission has limited relevance to early childhood settings and does not clearly identify intended outcomes.	The submission is somewhat relevant to early childhood settings, though the intended outcomes are not fully articulated.	The submission is highly relevant to early childhood settings and provides a clear and well-defined set of intended outcomes.	
Practical Application	The submission faces significant feasibility concerns, including major issues with timeline, or resources, which make execution challenging or unlikely.	The submission is somewhat feasible but has notable gaps or uncertainties in timeline, or resource allocation that need addressing.	The submission is generally feasible, but may require minor adjustments in terms of timeline, or resources for successful execution.	The submission is clear and well-defined for successful execution, including a comprehensive consideration of timeline, and resources.	



Process & Implementation Committee: Second Review Research-Based

Categories	1	2	3	4	Score
Promotion of Shared Access	The submission does not indicate a description or plan to ensure shared access to resources or	The submission indicates a minimal description or plan to ensure shared access to resources or services.	The submission indicates a plan describing a way to ensure shared access to resources and services.	The submission indicates a well described and clear plan to ensure shared access to resources and services.	
Program Goals and Structure	The program goals and components are unclear, overly broad, poorly defined, or missing key activities.	The program goals and components are somewhat vague and include limited details on activities.	The program goals and components are mostly clear but lack measurable elements and include some details on activities.	The program goals and components are clear, specific, and measurable. Program activities follow logical sequencing with clear roles and direct link to target population.	
Quality of Submission	The submission would benefit from further development and does not include information on the supports needed or available for implementation.	The submission lacks clear and detailed explanations regarding the supports required or available for implementation.	The submission is well thought out, but is still lacking some information on what supports are available or required to implement.	The submission is well thought out and contains comprehensive information regarding what supports are available or required to implement.	
Budget and Narrative	The budget and narrative are vague or insufficient.	The budget and narrative lack clarity, making it difficult to assess feasibility of implementation.	The budget and narrative are clearly defined, but may have some gaps or unrealistic assumptions.	The budget and narrative are clear and comprehensive in detail including realistic staffing and justifiable expenses ensuring successful program	

Replicability	The practice does not seem easily replicable by other practitioners and may require substantial modifications.	The practice may be replicable, but the lack of sufficient information or detail makes full replication challenging.	The practice is replicable by other practitioners, but may require some slight modifications and/or extra resources.	The practice has demonstrated clear replicability.	
Sustainability	The submission does not include evidence indicating sustainability beyond the initial implementation period and does not reference a plan to sustain implementation.	The submission includes some evidence indicating sustainability resources and/or capacity beyond the initial implementation period and briefly references a plan to	The submission includes evidence indicating sustainability of resources and capacity beyond the initial implementation period and includes a plan to sustain implementation.	The submission includes clear evidence indicating sustainability of resources and capacity beyond the initial implementation period and includes a well defined plan to sustain	
Scalability of the Program	The program is not designed for scalability, and there are no clear strategies for expanding or adapting it to other regions or contexts.	The program includes some considerations for scalability, but lacks clear strategies for expanding or adapting it to other	The program is designed with scalability in mind, but the strategies for expanding or adapting it to other regions or contexts are underdeveloped.	The program is designed for statewide scalability and includes clear strategies for expanding or adapting it to other regions or contexts.	



Innovative Ideas

Categories	1	2	3	4	Score
Innovation	The submission is not innovative and does not offer any new ways of addressing a problem or challenge previously identified in Oklahoma.	The submission is somewhat innovative but lacks originality or is lacking information.	The submission is innovative, introducing new methods to Oklahoma, or ways of thinking within an established program or framework.	The submission is groundbreaking and presents a unique solution or concept not previously explored in Oklahoma.	
Alignment with Current Needs or Challenges	The submission lacks clear relevance to current challenges or needs, or is disconnected from the OK Clearinghouse focus area.	The submission addresses a minor, or less pressing, challenge with limited relevance to the OK Clearinghouse focus area.	The submission addresses an important challenge and aligns somewhat with the OK Clearinghouse focus area.	The submission directly addresses a significant need or challenge previously identified with clear relevance to the OK Clearinghouse focus area.	
Goals, Objectives, and Evaluation Plan	The goals and objectives are unclear or missing, and the evaluation plan is vague or incomplete.	The goals and objectives lack clarity or alignment, and the evaluation plan needs more specificity in measuring outcomes.	The goals and objectives are clear and aligned, though the evaluation plan could use more detail on specific metrics.	There are clear, measurable goals and objectives with a comprehensive, detailed evaluation plan that effectively measures success.	
Impact on Field/Community	The results or outcomes have little to no potential impact on early childhood practice, policy, or the field.	The outcomes are somewhat relevant but have limited potential for broader impact in early childhood.	The results or outcomes have clear potential to influence early childhood practice, policy, or future research in early childhood.	The results or outcomes have significant potential to influence practice, policy, or future research in early childhood.	
Scalability of the Program	The program is not designed for scalability, and there are no clear strategies for expanding or adapting it to other regions or contexts.	The program includes some considerations for scalability, but lacks clear strategies for expanding or adapting it to other regions or contexts.	The program is designed with scalability in mind, but the strategies for expanding or adapting it to other regions or contexts are underdeveloped.	The program is designed for statewide scalability and includes clear strategies for expanding or adapting it to other regions or contexts.	

Feasibility	The submission indicates neither the resources nor capacity to implement this idea, and contains major unaddressed obstacles. The budget and narrative are vague or insufficient.	The submission indicates either the resources or capacity do not exist to implement this idea, or obtaining them could be difficult. The budget and narrative lack clarity, making it difficult to assess feasibility of implementation.	The submission identifies possible resources and some available capacity with a plan to obtain both. The budget and narrative are clearly defined, but may have some gaps or unrealistic assumptions.	The submission details readily available resources and current capacity to implement this idea. The budget and narrative are clear and comprehensive in detail, including realistic staffing and justifiable expenses, ensuring successful program implementation.	
Long-Term Vision	The submission lacks a clear long-term vision, making it difficult to foresee its potential for sustained impact or future growth.	The idea has a general long-term vision, but the steps for achieving growth and impact are vague or underdeveloped.	The idea has a solid long-term vision with some clear steps, but may lack some detail or clarity in the path forward.	The idea presents a compelling and well-defined long-term vision with clear, actionable steps for future growth and sustained impact.	