



Effectiveness, Utility, and Evidence Tool

The *Students at the Center: Effectiveness, Utility, and Evidence Tool* is designed to be used as a companion to the *Students at the Center: Alignment Tool*. The quality vetting tool is designed to evaluate and rate the usability and legibility of resources and tools. To complement the Students at the Center alignment tool, we wanted to also define and report on the overall utility and effectiveness of a given tool or resource.

Name of Tool/Resource	
Source (<i>Include website if applicable</i>)	
Brief Tool/Resource Description (<i>For example: grade, content area, potential use, etc.</i>)	
Date of Review	

**Adapted from the US Department of Education's resource vetting tool.*

Please fill out the highlighted areas, including notes when necessary.

Rating Scale: **0**=not at all, **1**=slightly, **2**=moderately, **3**=to a great extent, **NA**= Not Applicable

EFFECTIVENESS	RATING	NOTES
Clear Presentation: How clear is the description of what the resource offers?		
Completeness: To what extent does this resource answer the questions posed (if it is a research study)?		
Appropriateness: How appropriate is the language for the target audience (level of technical language)?		
Visual Representation: For example, how effective are the graphic elements (e.g. font type and size, design elements, visual lay out of charts, and graphs) in communicating the data/material?		
Content: To what degree does the resource add value and provide useful information to the stated audience?		
AVERAGE OF EFFECTIVENESS SECTION:		

UTILITY	RATING	NOTES
Usefulness: Is the content clear and easy to understand?		
Addresses the Intended Audience's Needs: How effective is the resource in meeting this audience's needs?		
Promote to Action: To what extent does the resource: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Motivate users to action. For example, does the piece include next-step action items? • Provide additional resources. If so, how useful are those resources? 		
Persuasive: For example, is the piece convincing; is the argument logical and well supported; is the tone compelling?		
Applicable: For example, if the piece is focused on a specific topic or practice, are the key ideas applicable to a broad audience?		
Alignment with SatC Tenets: Does the resource align with some or all the tenets of SatC? Are there any areas of direct conflict?		
AVERAGE OF UTILITY SECTION:		

Evidence	RATING	NOTES
Informed by Current Research: To the best of your knowledge, does the information presented in the resource take into account the highest-quality research in particular in assessment, motivation and engagement, and mind, brain and education?		
Level of Research-based Findings: To what degree are you confident in the research supporting the findings?		
Are Data Represented Accurately: For example, do charts and graphs accurately reflect and support the content of the piece?		
AVERAGE OF EVIDENCE SECTION:		

Rating Scale: **0**=not at all, **1**=slightly, **2**=moderately, **3**=to a great extent, **NA**= Not Applicable¹

To be filled out by Reviewer:

Average of Quality Section: _____

Average of Utility Section: _____

Average of Evidence of Effectiveness Section: _____

Final Average (Average of Three Sections): _____

¹If any elements are given a rating of N/A, reduce the denominator in that section appropriately. The final average needs to be between 2 (moderately) and 3 (to a great extent).