CHILD CARE ALLIANCE LOS ANGELES

Phase 2 Review Rubric (Attachment A)

Dual Language Learner Family Engagement Content Development RFQ

Name of Applicant: _____

Area of Expertise: Content Development/Curriculum Design Total Points: /16

Criteria	0 Points	1 Point	2 Points	3 Points	4 Points
Experience: Describe the length of time and experiences that the applicant has been actively involved in work relevant to early childhood education, curriculum development and design, parent education/ family engagement, and/or dual language learning. Explain how these experiences relate to the applicant having significant knowledge and expertise in the areas listed. (1 page)	No relevant experience	Limited relevant experience: less than 2 years of work relevant to early childhood education, family engagement, or curriculum design. No explanation related to the applicant's experiences and the expertise areas listed.	Moderate relevant experience: 2-4 years of work relevant to early childhood education, family engagement, or curriculum design. Limited explanation related to the applicant's experiences and the expertise areas listed.	Significant relevant experience: 5-7 years of work relevant to early childhood education, family engagement, or curriculum design. Clear explanation related to the applicant's experiences and the expertise areas listed.	Extensive relevant experience: 7+ years of work relevant to early childhood education, family engagement, or curriculum design. Thorough, detailed explanation related to the applicant's experiences and the expertise areas listed.
Reviewer Notes					
Examples of Previous Work: Provide 2 examples of prior curriculum development experiences, explaining the scope of work and timeline from development to completion.	No curriculum samples provided.	Only 1 curriculum sample provided.	Two curriculum development samples provided. Limited explanation of scope of work and timeline from development to completion.	Two curriculum development samples provided with direct relevance to work requested in RFQ. Clear explanation of scope of work and timeline from development to completion.	Two curriculum development samples provided with direct relevance to work requested in RFQ. Thorough explanation of scope of work and timeline from development to completion.

Reviewer Notes					
Criteria	**0 Points**	**1 point**	**2 Points**	**3 Points**	**4 Points**
Quality of Curriculum Samples: Applicant presented well-organized, research based curriculum samples that were interactive and took into account adult learning theory. These samples included clear descriptions of trainer content and responsibilities as well as clear objectives and outcomes for participants. One sample is specifically focused on dual language learning content for families or early educators.	No curriculum samples submitted	Curriculum samples were poorly organized, with limited interactive activities, objectives, and expected outcomes. Content was unclear.	Curriculum samples were moderately organized with a few interactive activities. Objectives and expected outcomes were vague and not directly tied to content. Trainer content was limited and not clear enough to provide direction for a training. One sample focused on dual language learning.	Curriculum samples were well organized, with a several interactive activities. Objectives and expected outcomes were clear and directly tied to content. Trainer content was clear enough to provide direction for a training. One sample focused on dual language learning.	Curriculum samples were very well organized, with a several interactive activities directly related to content. Objectives and expected outcomes were very clear and directly tied to content. Trainer content was clear, with helpful notes, resources and direction for a training. One sample focused on dual language learning.
Reviewer Notes:					
Quality of Application: Applicant presented clear, concise, well-written and organized responses; answered questions clearly and provided specific examples, timelines, and details regarding their prior experiences.	Poor, unacceptable writing and presentation	Adequate writing and presentation of application materials. Question responses were vague and did not provide specific examples to determine qualifications or experiences.	Satisfactory writing and presentation of application materials. Responses were mostly clear but not always well-organized. Limited specific examples and timelines regarding prior experiences.	Excellent writing and presentation of application materials. Responses were very clear and well organized. Several specific examples were provided related to RFQ. Timelines were easy to follow and clear.	Exceptional writing and presentation of application materials. Responses were thorough, well thought out, and very organized. Numerous specific examples were provided that showed clear connection between prior experiences and RFQ.

					Timelines were easy to follow and clear.
Reviewer Notes:					