

STEM Learning Platform Invitational RFP Scoring Rubric

Reviewer:

Evaluation Criteria	Points Possible	Reviewer Score	Average Total	Comments/Recommendations
<p>Platform Design</p> <p>Concise and clear statement of goals and measurable objectives aligned with the stated priorities of the RFP (i.e., foster regional collaboration on one or more STEM college readiness needs, establish a STEM learning platform to be used by the region for the advancement of college ready STEM teaching and learning, establish a stewardship group responsible for the success of the learning platform and establish a business plan for the platform that sustains itself after initial state funding is expended).</p> <p>1 – Proposal states goals but does not connect to measures or priorities.</p> <p>5 – Proposal states goals and connects to measures and priorities but lacks detail.</p> <p>10 – Proposal provides detailed and clear connection between goals, measurable objectives and priorities.</p>	<p>40</p> <p>10</p>			
<p>Key tasks and milestones. The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines and milestones for accomplishing project task. Detailed timeline for project activities from January 2011 through June 2011. Include all required tasks to carry out all aspects of the project. Fall 2011: Some aspect of the platform is operational (if not all). Fall 2012: Full operational status.</p> <p>1 – Proposal includes limited timeline but may lack detail, may have missing key tasks and/or project deliverables.</p> <p>5 – Proposal includes reasonable timeline with all required tasks and deliverables.</p> <p>10– Proposal provides detailed and clear project timeline with required tasks for the project and deliverables.</p>	<p>10</p>			
<p>A. Outreach plan. Demonstration that partnership will function to ensure optimal regional impact.</p>	<p>10</p>			

Evaluation Criteria	Points Possible	Reviewer Score	Average Total	Comments/Recommendations
<p>1 – Partnership provides minimal information about regional impact. Impact does not reach a broad enough region.</p> <p>3 – Partnership has clear plans to have regional impact but region is not broad and far-reaching.</p> <p>5 – Partnership is well positioned to ensure optimum regional impact. Planning is underway and initial regional impact is demonstrated.</p> <p>B. Evidence that the partnership has the capability to mobilize a broad range of traditional and non-traditional education stakeholders into the process. Proposal includes plans to engage STEM Schools, K-8 Programs of Excellence, other STEM initiatives and how partnership would interact with regions not currently served.</p> <p>1 – Proposal provides limited evidence that partnership has the appropriate type(s) of leadership capacity to mobilize partners but partnerships are not broad enough to include traditional and non-traditional education stakeholders.</p> <p>3 – Proposal provides evidence that partnership has the appropriate type(s) of leadership capacity to mobilize a broad range of traditional and non-traditional education stakeholders in process.</p> <p>5 – Proposal provides strong evidence that partnership has the appropriate type(s) of leadership capacity and mixture of non-traditional and traditional educators not only “at the table” but will be used for research, development and implementation of STEM programs connected to the learning platform.</p>				
<p>A. Evaluation. The extent to which the applicant describes strategies for using data to manage platform implementation, inform decision-making, engage stakeholders and measure success. Collecting, analyzing and using data for decision-making and on-going improvement. Describes the capacity of the partnership to carry out a rigorous local evaluation. Identifies key evaluation personnel and describe how the expertise of each individual will be utilized. Describes how the partnership will collect data on students and teachers impacted by the platform. Describes a formative and summative evaluation plan including identification of measurable outcomes that will be collected and tracked to evaluate the partnership's effectiveness.</p> <p>1 – Proposal outlines a limited plan to carry out a local evaluation but plan may not include all required elements. (Key evaluation personnel, data collection on students and teachers engaged in the platform, formative and summative outcomes.)</p>	10			

Evaluation Criteria	Points Possible	Reviewer Score	Average Total	Comments/Recommendations
<p>3 – Proposal outlines capacity of partnership to carry out a reasonable local evaluation including all required evaluation requirements. (Key evaluation personnel, data collection on students and teachers impacted through the platform, formative and summative outcomes.)</p> <p>5 – Proposal outlines the capacity of partnership to carry out a strong and rigorous local evaluation plan. Plan is high-quality including the following elements: use of student achievement as at least one means of outcome; articulation of how the data will be shared back with the region and state; and how STEM learning platform will be measured for effectiveness.</p> <p>B. Describes how evaluation findings will be communicated to external stakeholders and how the project will ensure timely and accurate reporting to the STEM Committee. Explain how findings will be communicated to and used by partnership members and other stakeholders for program improvement.</p> <p>1 – Proposal describes a limited plan to communicate evaluation findings to STEM Committee and stakeholders but may lack breadth in means of communicating and using findings.</p> <p>3 – Proposal describes a reasonable plan to communicate evaluation findings to external stakeholders including the STEM Committee. Plan includes means using evaluation findings to stakeholders for program improvement.</p> <p>5 – Proposal describes an extensive and effective communications plan to communicate evaluations results to external stakeholders and the STEM Committee. The plan includes an explanation of how the results will be communicated to improve the program.</p>				
Knowledge, Experience and History	20			
<p>A. Prior work in college ready STEM connected to the capacity of the proposed platform to be successful, scalable and sustainable. The extent to which the learning platform is based on the best available evidence including, where available, strong or moderate evidence.</p> <p>1 – Proposal describes limited evidence on the platform’s proposed capacity to meet identified goals and measures.</p> <p>5 – Moderate evidence: Proposal describes reasonable evidence of the platform’s capacity to meet identified goals and measures.</p> <p>10 – Strong evidence: Proposal describes strong evidence of the platform’s capacity to meet identified goals and measures.</p>	10			

Evaluation Criteria	Points Possible	Reviewer Score	Average Total	Comments/Recommendations
<p>B. Personnel Qualifications. The qualifications, relevant training and experience of the applicant including the project director and prior performance of the applicant on similar efforts. Listing and documentation of key individuals (e.g., PI, IHE faculty, district leaders, business and industry, etc.) and partnerships from preK-12, higher education, and community/business participating in project activities and their respective roles, responsibilities or contributions.</p> <p>1 – Little meaningful involvement from key individuals and partnerships from preK-12, higher education and community/business. Respective roles, responsibilities and contributions are not spelled out.</p> <p>5 – Progress has been demonstrated securing key individuals and partnerships from preK-12, higher education and community/business but respective roles, responsibilities and contributions are still under development.</p> <p>10 – Strong demonstration that key individuals, partnerships from preK-12, higher education and community/business are actively engaged with the partnership. Respective roles, responsibilities and contributions of partners are well underway and demonstration project efficacy is demonstrated.</p>	10			
Level of Effort and Strength of Principal Partners	30			
<p>A. Project expenses tied to goals and outcomes. Documentation of how the budget will be apportioned and prioritized. Describes all anticipated platform expenses for the period. Include an explanation of how each expense reflects the goals and scope of the project.</p> <p>1 – Proposal includes budget but may lack detail or have key elements missing and/or how expense reflects the goals and scope of the project.</p> <p>3 – Proposal provides detailed budget including apportionments and prioritization. Includes explanation of how expenses reflect the goals and scope of project. Reasonable use of resources</p> <p>5 – Proposal includes thorough budget with documentation of how the budget will be apportioned and prioritized. Describes how anticipated expenses reflect the goals and scope of project and person(s) responsible. Excellent use of resources</p> <p>B. Evidence that partnership has received fiscal and in-kind support from regional education and business entities.</p> <p>1 – Limited evidence of securing resources and/or in-kind support needed to achieve success in terms of having capacity to have regional impact and sustainability.</p>	10			

Evaluation Criteria	Points Possible	Reviewer Score	Average Total	Comments/Recommendations
<p>3 – Some evidence of securing resources and/or in-kind support needed to achieve success in terms of having capacity to have regional impact and sustainability.</p> <p>5 – Strong evidence of securing resources and/or in-kind support needed to achieve success in terms of having regional impact and platform sustainability.</p>				
<p>*Signed MOUs on learning platform’s fiscal, operational and performance management. Describes the partnership’s meaningful connectivity to any existing STEM infrastructures and initiatives such as the Ohio Department of Education’s Next Generation Learners initiative, regional “informal” education providers, middle school and high school transformation initiatives (Early College High Schools, Credit Flexibility) and higher education access initiatives (e.g., Choose Ohio First Scholarship program, Ohio Woodrow Wilson STEM Teaching Fellows program). This list is not exhaustive.</p> <p>1 – MOU describes limited connectivity to existing STEM infrastructures and initiatives but provides minimal evidence of leveraging multiple state-funded initiatives. MOU does not clearly identify on-going roles, commitments and accountabilities of core platform partners.</p> <p>5 – MOU describes partnership’s connectivity to existing regional and statewide STEM infrastructures and initiatives and evidence of leveraging multiple state-funded initiatives. MOU reasonably identifies on-going roles, commitments and accountabilities of core platform partners.</p> <p>10 – MOU strongly describes connectivity to existing infrastructures and transformational initiatives of the Ohio Department of Education and the Ohio Board of Regents. Partnership demonstrates optimal leveraging power of multiple state-funded initiatives. MOU strongly identifies on-going roles, commitments and accountabilities of core platform partners.</p>	10			
<p>Partnership efficacy. Planning grant final report must be included as Appendix. Evidence that partnership will continue to receive commitment of sustained and verifiable fiscal and in-kind support from regional education and business entities engaged in the platform.</p> <p>1 – Limited commitment/resources from partners for a sustainable STEM learning platform and the plan lacks the necessary qualities or resources are in place for long-term success.</p> <p>5 – Some commitment/resources from partnerships for a sustainable STEM learning platform and some of the necessary qualities or resources are in place for long-term success.</p> <p>10 – Strong commitment/resources from partnerships for a sustainable STEM learning platform and many of the necessary qualities or resources are in place for long-term success.</p>	10			

Evaluation Criteria	Points Possible	Reviewer Score	Average Total	Comments/Recommendations
Participation in State-wide Network	10			
<p data-bbox="65 272 995 397">A. The potential for continued support of the project after state funding ends, including a demonstrated commitment of appropriate entities to sustain and scale up the learning platform. Demonstration that partnership will ensure optimal regional connectivity and adaptability of knowledge and practices.</p> <p data-bbox="65 422 995 511">1 – Limited progress has been made with securing partnerships and/or evidence is missing that partnership will ensure optimal regional connectivity and adaptability of knowledge and practices.</p> <p data-bbox="65 544 995 609">3 – Progress has been demonstrated in the planning grant of implementing a learning platform, and all of the necessary qualities are in place.</p> <p data-bbox="65 641 995 730">5 – Partnership lists partners with the ability to optimize regional influence, especially in preK-12 education. Statewide connectivity is outlined of how the partnership will push and pull information through the use of the platform.</p> <p data-bbox="65 755 995 876">B. Evidence of working with Battelle, the non-profit entity selected by the STEM Committee. Indicate partnership commitment to participating in collaborative sharing lessons and meetings, and through collaborative on-line tools that may be employed by the Ohio STEM Learning Network.</p> <p data-bbox="65 909 995 974">1 – Proposal presents minimal evidence of working with the non-profit entity, Battelle. Outlined commitment to participate in collaborative sharing lessons.</p> <p data-bbox="65 1006 995 1096">3 –Proposal presents evidence of working with Battelle and demonstration of partnership commitment to participating in collaborative sharing lessons and meetings through the Ohio STEM Learning Network.</p> <p data-bbox="65 1128 995 1218">5 – Proposal presents strong evidence of effectively working with Battelle. Proposal demonstrates how the partnership has worked with Battelle and the Ohio STEM Learning Network to establish connectivity and productivity.</p>	10			