

CS Promise Program

EVALUATION RUBRIC 2026 – 2027 ACADEMIC YEAR

Section A: Technical Review

All technical review elements must be completed for the application to be accepted for quality review. **Applications that FAIL the technical review will not be scored on the quality elements.**

SECTION A: ORGANIZATIONAL INFORMATION		
Application Type: New Applicant or Returning Provider	Yes	No
Returning Provider changes described (Skip this question if provider is a new applicant)	Yes	No
1. Name of Organization	Yes	No
2. Address	Yes	No
3. City, State, and Zip Code	Yes	No
4. Phone	Yes	No
5. Organization Email	Yes	No
6. Name and Title of Authorized Contact	Yes	No
7. Authorized Contact Address (if different from above)	Yes	N/A
8. Authorized Contact City, State, and Zip Code	Yes	N/A
9. Authorized Contact Phone	Yes	N/A
10. Authorized Contact Email	Yes	N/A
11. Organization Type	Yes	No
12. Instructors/Educators (Note: Providers MUST include instructors/educators to pass the technical review)	Yes	No
13. Background checks (Note: Providers MUST perform background checks to pass the technical review)	Yes	No
14. Number of schools the organization can support during a school year	Yes	No
15. Number of years the organization has been providing educational services	Yes	No
STATUS OF TECHNICAL REVIEW	PASS	FAIL

Section B: Quality Review

If required, each application that has **passed the technical review** will have a quality review completed. The following quality criteria will be scored by a team of reviewers consisting of representatives from the Ohio Department of Education and Workforce. Scorers will evaluate each application and award points based on the following criteria.

Not Addressed <i>0 points</i>	The response is not provided.
Poorly Developed <i>1 point</i>	The response is significantly incomplete, missing required evidence, or otherwise raises substantial concerns about the viability of the plan or the applicant's capacity to execute it.
Partially Developed <i>2 points</i>	The response meets less than half of the established criteria or contains substantial gaps in other areas.
Adequately Developed <i>3 points</i>	The response meets the established criteria but is lacking details on how the response would be implemented effectively.
Fully Developed	The response demonstrates the applicant's thorough understanding of key issues via specific and accurate information. The response presents a clear, realistic picture of how the applicant expects to operate and inspires confidence in the applicant's capacity to execute the plan effectively.

SECTION B: QUALITY REVIEW					
	<i>Not Addressed</i>	<i>Poorly Developed</i>	<i>Partially Developed</i>	<i>Adequately Developed</i>	<i>Fully Developed</i>
16. Executive Summary	0	1	2	3	4
17. Computer Science Course Offerings	0	1	2	3	4
18. Course Delivery	0	1	2	3	4
19. Materials aligned to Ohio's Learning Standards for Computer Science	0	1	2	3	4
20. Approach aligned with research on effective teaching and learning	0	1	2	3	4
21. Student Supports	0	1	2	3	4
22. Alignment with High-Quality Instructional Materials (HQIM)	0	1	2	3	4
23. Data-driven instruction	0	1	2	3	4
24. Prior experience	0	1	2	3	4
Comments:					
				TOTAL	

Section C: Application Course Attachments

Applications should include the subject code, description of delivery, and a pacing guide or similar documentation showing course content and learning standards alignment for each course.

Applications that are missing the required course attachments (Section C) **will not be will not be included on the CS Promise program provider list.**

SECTION C: APPLICATION COURSE ATTACHMENTS		
Subject code listed for each course	Yes	No
Delivery mode described for each course	Yes	No
Pacing guide or similar documentation included for each course	Yes	No
STATUS OF APPLICATION COURSE ATTACHMENTS	PASS	FAIL