# Computer Science Promise Approved Provider Scoring Rubric

## Technical Review

The following technical elements must be completed for applications to be accepted and reviewed. Applications not including each required item listed below will not be scored on the quality elements.

|  |
| --- |
| **Section A: Organizational Information** |
| Application Type | Yes | No |
| 1. Name of Organization
 | Yes | No |
| 1. Address
 | Yes | No |
| 1. City, State, and Zip Code
 | Yes | No |
| 1. Phone
 | Yes | No |
| 1. Organization Email
 | Yes | No |
| 1. Name and Title of Authorized Contact
 | Yes | No |
| 1. Authorized Contact Address (if different from above)
 | Yes | N/A |
| 1. Authorized Contact City, State, and Zip Code
 | Yes | N/A |
| 1. Authorized Contact Phone
 | Yes | N/A |
| 1. Authorized Contact Email
 | Yes | N/A |
| 1. Organization Type
 | Yes | No |
| 1. Background checks
 | Yes | No |
| 1. Number of Schools the Educational Program can support during a school year
 | Yes | No |
| 1. Number of years the organization has been providing educational services
 | Yes | No |

## Quality Review

Each application that has met 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 Department of Education and Workforce. Scorers will evaluate each application and award points based on the following criteria.

**Not Addressed/0 Points**The response is not provided.

**Poorly Developed/1 Point**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/2 Points**The response meets less than half of the established criteria or contains substantial gaps in other areas.

**Adequately Developed/3 Points**

The response meets the established criteria.

**Fully Developed/4 Points**

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** |
|  | Not Addressed | Poorly Developed | Partially Developed | Adequately Developed | Fully Developed |
| 1. Executive Summary
 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 1. Computer Science Course Offerings
 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 1. Course Delivery
 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 1. To what degree are materials authentically aligned to Ohio’s High School Learning Standards for Computer Science?
 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 1. Is there evidence that the approach is aligned with research on effective teaching and learning?
 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 1. Student Supports – Does the content describe how instruction will be provided to students and the supports available for students?
 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 1. High-Quality Instructional Materials - Does the content support the HQIM, including the four features listed above in this RFI?
 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 1. Data-Driven Instruction- Does the response explain how the program provides and uses data to drive individualized instruction?
 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 1. Prior Experience – Does the provider show evidence of success in course delivery and evidence that demonstrate positive impact on student achievement?
 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Comments: |  |
| Total |  |