



Iowa Governor's STEM Advisory Council STEM Scale-Up Program Provider Application Rubric

The Iowa Governor's STEM Advisory Council's mission is to bring top STEM education opportunities to all learners, especially those historically underserved. The intent of the Scale-Up program is to seed, jumpstart or expand little-known and exemplary programs proven to inspire and educate preK-12 students, enabling educational organizations to sustain beyond the Council's trial investment.

Scores will be weighted to reach the full scale score provided in Section 5.3 of the Request for Proposals.

Exhibit 3 - Experience

The Respondent must provide the following information regarding its experience:

- Number of years in business.
- Length of time the program has been in existence.
- Number of years of experience with providing the types of services sought by the RFP.
- The level of technical experience in providing the types of services sought by the RFP.
- A list of all goods and/or services similar to those sought by this RFP that the Respondent has provided to other businesses or governmental entities.
- Letters of reference from three (3) previous or current customers or clients knowledgeable of the Respondent's performance in providing goods and/or services similar to the goods and/or services described in this RFP and a contact person and telephone number for each reference.

Score	Reason for assigning the score
7-6	The provider has been in business a minimum of 2 years, and the program proposed has been implemented with youth for a minimum of 1 year. The description of the program's experience demonstrates that the organization has the stability to support a commitment to educators well beyond 3 years. The respondent's list of goods and/or services provided to other entities provides strong evidence that the respondent has the technical experience to provide the goods and services proposed in this RFP. All three letters of reference from previous or current customers/clients are detailed and positive in their support that the respondent's experience is well suited to the services proposed.
5-4	The provider has been in business a minimum of 2 years, and the program proposed has been implemented with youth for a minimum of 1 year. The description of the program's experience demonstrates that the organization has the stability to support a commitment to educators at least 3 years. The respondent's list of goods and/or services provided to other entities provides sufficient evidence that the respondent has the technical experience to provide the goods and services proposed in this RFP.

	At least two letters of reference from previous or current customers/clients are detailed and positive in their support that the respondent's experience is well suited to the services proposed. One letter of reference is positive, but not detailed.
3-2	The provider has been in business a minimum of 2 years, and the program proposed has been implemented with youth for a minimum of 1 year. The description of the program's experience demonstrates that the organization has the stability to support a commitment to educators at least 3 years. The respondent's list of goods and/or services provided to other entities provides some evidence that the respondent has the technical experience to provide the goods and services proposed in this RFP, but minor questions linger. All letters of reference from previous or current customers/clients are positive in their support that the respondent's experience is suited to the services proposed. Letters lack detail.
1-0	The provider has not been in business a minimum of 2 years, and/or the program proposed has not been implemented with youth for a minimum of 1 year. Something in the description of the program's experience provides evidence that the organization may not have the stability to support a commitment to educators at least 3 years. The respondent's list of goods and/or services provided to other entities lacks evidence that the respondent has the technical experience to provide the goods and services proposed in this RFP or provides evidence that essential experience is lacking. Any single letter of reference is negative or provides an example where the respondent's experience may be lacking in providing the services proposed.

Exhibit 5 - Personnel

Question to be evaluated:

- Describe the experience of each person on the leadership team.
- Describe the number, and experience, of all personnel working on this program.
- Provide any information on the need for additional contracted personnel.
- Provide the information of the project manager that will lead these efforts.

Score	Reason for assigning the score
7-6	Leadership team is clearly defined, and the relevant experience of each person on the leadership team is described in detail. Response includes need (yes/no). If yes, the number of additional contracted personnel and a detailed description of how contracted personnel will support the implementation of this project is included. The project manager to lead this effort is identified and the information about the individual is strong evidence they have the skills to lead this project in Iowa.
5-4	Leadership team is clearly defined, and the relevant experience of key personnel on the leadership team is described in detail. Response includes need (yes/no). If yes, the number of additional contracted personnel and a moderate description of how contracted personnel will support the implementation of this project is included. The project manager to lead this effort is identified and the information about the individual is sufficient evidence they have the skills to lead this project in Iowa.

3-2	Leadership team is sufficiently defined, and the relevant experience of some personnel on the leadership team is described. Response includes need (yes/no). If yes, the number of additional contracted personnel and a description of how contracted personnel will support the implementation of this project lacks detail. The project manager to lead this effort is identified and the information about the individual provides minimal evidence they have the skills to lead this project in Iowa.
1-0	Leadership team is not defined, and/or the relevant experience of some personnel on the leadership team is insufficient. Response includes need (yes/no). If yes, the number of additional contracted personnel and a description of how contracted personnel will support the implementation of this project is insufficient. The project manager to lead this effort is not identified or the information about the individual provides insufficient or contrary evidence that they have the skills to lead this project in Iowa.

Exhibit 6 - Past Training Experience

Question to be evaluated:

Provide examples of how the respondent has provided and staffed training in the past.

List past successful professional learning events your organization has sponsored with an emphasis on training educators.

Score	Reason for assigning the score
7-6	Provides strong evidence that respondent's experience facilitating training spans many trainings across multiple venues. Examples of training and ongoing support provides strong evidence that the provider is adaptable/responsive to the needs of educators. The list of past professional learning events sponsored by the organization demonstrates an emphasis on training educators and includes strong evidence of success training educators in the program proposed.
5-4	Provides sufficient evidence that respondent's experience facilitating training spans many trainings across multiple venues. Examples of training and ongoing support provides sufficient evidence that the provider is adaptable/responsive to the needs of educators. The list of past professional learning events sponsored by the organization demonstrates an emphasis on training educators and includes sufficient evidence of success training educators in the program proposed
3-2	Provides some evidence that respondent's experience facilitating training spans a few trainings across a limited variety of venues. Examples of training and ongoing support provides some evidence that the provider is adaptable/responsive to the needs of educators. The evidence that is missing is minor. The list of past professional learning events sponsored by the organization suggests an emphasis on training educators and includes some evidence of success training educators in the program proposed.

1-0	Provides evidence that respondent lacks experience facilitating training. Examples of training and ongoing support lack evidence that the provider is adaptable/responsive to the needs of educators. The list of past professional learning events sponsored by the organization is absent or unclear or provides evidence that raises concern about the program's training emphasis or success training educators.
-----	---

Exhibit 7 - Program Curriculum Overview

Question to be evaluated:

Provide a complete and comprehensive overview of the program curriculum. Specify appropriate grade level(s) the program fits. Provide additional information on the appropriate audience for both in-school and out-of-school settings.

Score	Reason for assigning the score
7-6	Curriculum overview is complete, comprehensive, and focused upon the program being submitted. Grade level(s) for this program are clearly defined. Overview strongly supports that the curriculum is appropriate for the grade level(s) proposed. Description clearly describes appropriate settings (in-school and out-of-school) for implementation and includes sufficient detail to allow an educator with a non-typical implementation model to determine if this program would fit their educational setting.
5-4	Curriculum overview is complete but not comprehensive, or includes unnecessary information (like program offerings not included in the scope proposed). Grade level(s) for this program are clearly defined. Overview sufficiently supports that the curriculum is appropriate for the grade level(s) proposed. Description clearly describes appropriate settings (in-school and out-of-school) for implementation and includes sufficient detail to allow an educator in a common implementation model to determine if this program would fit their educational setting.
3-2	Curriculum overview is mostly comprehensive, with minor omissions. Grade level(s) for this program are roughly defined. Overview suggests that the curriculum is appropriate for the grade level(s) proposed but lacks supporting evidence. Description broadly mentions appropriate settings (in-school and out-of-school) for implementation but lacks detail that would allow an educator in a common implementation model to determine if this program would fit their educational setting.
1-0	Curriculum overview lacks important detail. Grade level(s) for this program are unclear. Or, grade levels are roughly defined, but is difficult to determine if the curriculum is appropriate for the grade level(s) proposed. Appropriate settings (in-school and out-of-school) for implementation are not addressed in the overview.

Exhibit 8 - Evidence of Effect

Question to be evaluated:

Provide evidence of program effect. Include: summary of the body of research that was used to develop this program; summary of evaluation tactics; summary of findings of benefits to students, educators, others (content and skills growth, attitudes and intentions, etc); cite an instance where assessment informed program practices; and indicate source of evaluative evidence - external or internal. If internal, identify the evaluation entity.

Score	Reason for assigning the score
7-6	Source(s) of evaluative evidence clearly defined. Concise, detailed summary of the body of research used to develop the program provided, with citations . Provides a clear summary of evaluation tactics, highlighting benefits for students, educators, and other stakeholders in terms of content and skills acquisition/growth and attitude development and intentions. Includes an instance where assessment informed program practices .
5-4	Source(s) of evaluative evidence clearly defined. Overview of the body of research used to develop the program provided. Some sources mentioned. Provides a summary occasionally lacking clarity of evaluation tactics, highlighting benefits for students, educators, and/or other stakeholders and only some terms of content and skills acquisition/growth and/or attitude development and intentions. Explicit instances where assessment informed program practices are omitted.
3-2	Source(s) of evaluative evidence may be unclear . General statement about the research used to develop the program provided. Provides an unclear summary of evaluation tactics, highlighting benefits for students, educators, or other stakeholders and only some terms of content and skills acquisition/growth or attitude development and intentions. Explicit instances where assessment informed program practices are omitted .
1-0	Numerous facets of research base, evaluation tactics, benefits, sources, etc., are frequently overlooked or characterized by a lack of clarity.

Exhibit 9 -Iowa Academic Standards Integration

Questions to be evaluated:

The respondent must provide in detail how the professional learning package(s) is aligned with the Iowa Academic Standards, numeracy, and high-quality instruction.

- The respondent must provide in detail how the professional learning aligns to identified district/school needs based on district, school, or classroom data of students and/or educators.
- The respondent must provide how the “why” of the learning is clearly articulated based on specific quantitative and/or qualitative data.
- Choose three of Iowa’s Academic Standards and provide a detailed explanation of how each standard is addressed.
- Applicants must also describe how the program may be cross-disciplinary in nature to broaden the pool of potential educator applicants.

Score	Reason for assigning the score
7-6	Response includes strong evidence for how the professional learning aligns to identified district/school needs based on district, school, or classroom data of students and/or educators. Response includes a strong explanation of how the “why” of the learning is clearly articulated based on specific quantitative and qualitative data. The response includes three detailed examples of how the proposed program meets three of Iowa’s Academic Standards. The explanation provided clearly establishes a connection between the program activities and Iowa Academic Standards. The explanation shows that program activities integrate seamlessly across STEM subjects, effectively removing academic silos. The integration of numeracy is present in all three examples. The explanation demonstrates connections with other Academic areas including 21st Century Skills and other cross-curricular connections.
5-4	Response includes sufficient evidence for how the professional learning aligns to identified district/school needs based on district, school, or classroom data of students and/or educators. Response includes a sufficient explanation of how the “why” of the learning is clearly articulated based on specific quantitative or qualitative data. The response includes three examples of how the proposed program meets three of Iowa’s Academic Standards. The explanation provided clearly establishes a connection between the program activities and Iowa Academic Standards for Science, Technology, Engineering, and/or Mathematics, thus meeting Iowa Standards in STEM. The integration of numeracy is present in at least one example. The explanation demonstrates connections with other Academic areas, including 21st Century Skills and/or other cross-curricular connections.
3-2	Response lacks evidence for how the professional learning aligns to identified district/school needs based on district, school, or classroom data of students and/or educators. Response includes an explanation of how the “why” of the learning is articulated but explanation does not include data. The response includes three examples of how the proposed program meets three of Iowa’s Academic Standards. The explanation provided attempts to establish a connection between the program activities and Iowa Academic Standards for Science, Technology, Engineering, and/or Mathematics, but some connections are weak and/or numeracy is not addressed. Connections with other Academic areas, including 21st Century Skills and other cross-curricular connections are weak or not addressed.
1-0	Response does not include an explanation of how the “why” of the learning is articulated. The response fails to provide three examples of how the program meets Iowa’s Academic Standards. The explanation minimally or negligibly addresses the integration of Iowa Academic Standards, providing insufficient basis to ensure integration.

Exhibit 10 - Scalability

Questions to be evaluated:

Describe how this program has been implemented across a range of diverse learning environments, including in-school and out-of-school settings as well as through informal education providers (e.g., librarians, day care providers, extension staff, youth education staff) and other professionals engaged in delivering STEM Education. Provide details of requirements to implement the program (technology, time commitment for training and implementation, physical space). Detail what continuity looks like for this program over time and during expansion (e.g., educator turnover, additional materials to replace consumables, ongoing training, or adding sections).

Score	Reason for assigning the score
7-6	The program has showcased its proficiency in implementing across various diverse learning environments. The program demonstrates substantial capacity to maintain quality over time and during expansion. The response offers a comprehensive description of the infrastructure available for educators in Iowa to ensure continuity of program outcomes over time and during expansion.
5-4	The program demonstrates potential for implementation across diverse learning environments. The program demonstrates capacity to maintain quality over time and during expansion. The response offers sufficient infrastructure available for educators in Iowa to ensure continuity of program outcomes over time and during expansion.
3-2	The program may face challenges in implementing across diverse learning environments. The program demonstrates little evidence of capacity to maintain quality over time and during expansion. The program's infrastructure for educators in Iowa to ensure continuity of program outcomes over time and during expansion lacks clarity.
1-0	The program description lacks clarity regarding the learning environments it serves. The program provides no evidence of capacity to maintain quality over time and during expansion. The program's infrastructure for educators in Iowa provides no assurance continuity of program outcomes over time and during expansion.

Exhibit 11 - Professional Development/ Training

Questions to be evaluated:

Detail how the initial professional development/training will be delivered. Provide a detailed agenda of what PD and training may look like for selected awardees. Professional development/training should include opportunities for participants to engage with materials/kits and apply professional learning during the session. It should include opportunities to discuss implementation in the educator's specific context with peers and experts. Provide information on how the respondent will reserve training spaces for both in-person and/or virtual settings, manage registration, verify participant attendance, and address other logistical needs as required for a potential statewide applicant pool.

Score	Reason for assigning the score
7-6	A clear description is provided of how professional development/training will enhance the pedagogy and content knowledge of Iowa's STEM educators. The description provided for training is clear, covering all expectations for the delivery of the Scale-Up Program training. It includes provisions for engaging with materials/kits, applying professional learning during the session, and discussing implementation in the educator's specific context with peers and experts. The description details how the respondent will secure training spaces in all applicable settings (e.g. in-person and in virtual settings), manage registration, verify participant attendance, and address other logistical needs as required for a potential statewide applicant pool. Response details who will provide ongoing support to Iowa educators.
5-4	A somewhat clear description is provided of how professional development/training will enhance the pedagogy and content knowledge of Iowa's STEM educators. The description provided for training covers 2-3 expectations for Scale-Up Program training delivery except for facilitating discussions among educators about implementation in their specific context with peers and experts. It includes some provisions for engaging with materials/kits, applying professional learning during the session, and discussing implementation in the educator's specific context with peers and experts. The description sufficiently addresses how the respondent will secure training spaces in all applicable settings (e.g. in-person and in virtual settings), manage registration, verify participant attendance, and address other logistical needs as required for a potential statewide applicant pool. Response details who will provide ongoing support to Iowa educators.
3-2	An unclear description is provided of how professional development/training will enhance the pedagogy and content knowledge of Iowa's STEM educators. The description provided for training lacks detailed provisions for engaging with materials/kits, applying professional learning during the session, and discussing implementation in the educator's specific context with peers and experts. The description addresses how the respondent will secure training spaces, manage registration, verify participant attendance, but fails to offer sufficient detail or neglects to address one of the elements listed (training space, registration, or attendance). Response details who will provide ongoing support to Iowa educators.
1-0	An unclear description is provided of how professional development/training will enhance the pedagogy and content knowledge of Iowa's STEM educators. Information regarding professional development/training does not convey competency in strengthening educators' skills or knowledge. The description provided for training is minimal and does not meet the expectations for Scale-Up Program training delivery.

	The description fails to address two or more of the following: how the respondent will secure training spaces, manage registration, or verify participant attendance.
--	---

	Response details who will provide ongoing support to Iowa educators.
--	---

Exhibit 12 - Connection to the World of Work

Question to be evaluated:

Provide information on how students connect between learning and the world of work within your program. Highlight connections that relate to key industries in Iowa, including agriculture, advanced manufacturing, information technology, finance, and health careers.

Score	Reason for assigning the score
7-6	The program presents strong evidence that participants connect their learning to the world of work, including key industries of Iowa (agriculture, advanced manufacturing, information technology, finance, and health careers). The description for training provides context for Iowa communities and careers within Iowa.
5-4	The program provides sufficient evidence that participants connect their learning to the world of work, including key industries of Iowa (agriculture, advanced manufacturing, information technology, finance, and health careers). The description for training provides context for Iowa communities and careers within Iowa.
3-2	The program provides minimal evidence that participants connect their learning to the world of work. Lacking links to key industries of Iowa (agriculture, advanced manufacturing, information technology, finance, and health careers). The description provided for training fails to adequately articulate context for Iowa communities and careers within Iowa.
1-0	The program provides no evidence that participants connect their learning to the world of work in Iowa or elsewhere.

Program Budget

Questions to be evaluated:

The Respondent shall provide its Cost Proposal in a separate file for the proposed goods and/or services. All prices are quoted pursuant to the terms and conditions of this RFP. Respondent's Cost Proposal shall include an all-inclusive, itemized, total cost in U.S. Dollars (including all travel, expenses, etc. in prices) for the proposed services. All pricing to be FOB Destination, freight cost, and all expenses included; and based on Net 60 Days Payment Terms. Cost proposals must include the following:

- Provide any one time and recurring costs for services. Recurring costs are to be for a 3-year period to cover the initial term and extensions to the Contract.
- Any other costs associated with proposed services.
- Cost to sustain the program.
- Pricing for optional services.
- **FOR BUDGET COMPARISON ONLY: Please respond to the following scenario.** For the proposed program, please provide the total Year One, Year Two, and Year Three costs separately for an application that includes 20 educators assigned across 5 buildings, with each educator serving 20 students. *The response to the budget comparison scenario will be evaluated separately from this rubric.*

	3 Points	2 Points	1 Point	0 Points
Clarity and Organization	Budget is clearly presented, logically organized, and easy to understand.	Budget is mostly clear and organized, with minor issues.	Budget is mostly clear and organized, with minor issues.	Budget is poorly organized or very difficult to understand.

Accuracy and Justification	Budget amounts are accurate (e.g. align with the budget guidelines) and well justified with clear rationale.	Budget amounts are mostly accurate with some justification.	Budget includes questionable estimates or lacks clear justification.	Budget is inaccurate and lacks any justification.
Alignment with Application	Budget is well-aligned with the stated goals in the RFP.	Budget mostly aligns with the RFP.	Budget has some inconsistencies with the RFP.	Budget does not align with the RFP.
Completeness	All components of the budget are included (e.g., personnel, materials, training, etc.).	Most components of the budget are included, with minor omissions.	Some components of the budget are missing or insufficiently detailed.	Major components of the budget are missing or barely described.