RFP #NVCC-HSI-STEM

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

**PREFACE**: Naugatuck Valley Community College (NVCC) is preparing related applications in response to the US Department of Education Office of Postsecondary Education’s requests under the Hispanic Serving Institutions Science, Technology, Engineering & Mathematics (HSI-STEM) and Articulation Program and NSF’s Scholarships in Science, technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (S-STEM).

**NVCC is seeking the services of an experienced evaluation agency to provide technical assistance to our grant development team and to conduct program evaluations if these grants are funded.**

**PROJECT TIMELINE**: The services shall be utilized for an anticipated period of **5 years**, with an **expected start date of May 13, 2016**.

NVCC shall issue a contract agreement to the successful bidder. For the purpose of completing any additional grant requirements, the contract may be extended for 2 additional years, 1 year at a time.

**SCOPE OF SERVICES**:  In particular, NVCC requires the evaluation consultant to:

* work with the NVCC proposal development team on the development of the theories of change and logic models for the projects;
* use the models to frame the evaluations;
* through a collaborative process, develop the evaluation design sections of the proposals;
* incorporate their credentials to conduct the evaluations within the applications;
* provide general technical assistance and support to the team throughout the application preparation process;
* implement the proposed evaluations after obtaining appropriate IRB approvals; and
* provide appropriate informal and formal reports of progress.

Note that the HSI-STEM project includes competitive preference priorities associated with the evaluation design, and requires a rigorous evaluation that meets What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) requirements. For clarity, the following is excerpted from the grant application…

***Quality of the Evaluation Plan****: (Up to 20 points)*

*In determining the quality of the evaluation plan, the following factors are considered:*

1. *The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are specified and measurable (Up to 5 points);*
2. *The extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project (Up to 5 points); and*
3. *The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project’s effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) Evidence Standards with reservations  (Up to 10 points).*

***Note:***

*A strong evaluation plan should be included in the application project narrative and should be used, as appropriate, to shape the development of the project from the beginning of the grant period.  The plan should include benchmarks to monitor progress toward specific project objectives and also outcome measures to assess the impact on the proposed outcomes for the institution and project participants.  More specifically, the plan should identify the individual and/or organization that have agreed to serve as evaluator for the project and describe the qualifications of that evaluator.  The plan should describe the evaluation design, indicating: (1) what types of data will be collected; (2) when various types of data will be collected; (3) what methods will be used; (4) what instruments will be developed and when; (5) how the data will be analyzed; (6) when reports of results and outcomes will be available; and (7) how the applicant will use the information collected through the evaluation to monitor progress of the funded project and to provide accountability information both about success at the initial site and effective strategies for replication in other settings.  Applicants are encouraged to devote an appropriate level of resources to project evaluation.*

*Successful applicants will be expected to report annually on the progress of each project or study included in the grant, including a description of preliminary or key findings and an explanation of any changes in goals, objectives, methodology, or planned products or publications.*

*The proposed evaluation plan should be aligned to and further build evidence on the activity(ies)/ intervention(s) identified in the competitive priority evidence standard.  We encourage applicants to review the following technical assistance resources on evaluation: (1) WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook:* [*http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/references/idocviewer/doc.aspx?docid=19&amp;tocid=1*](http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/references/idocviewer/doc.aspx?docid=19&tocid=1)*; and (2) IES/NCEE Technical Methods papers:* [*http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/tech\_methods/*](http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/tech_methods/)*.*

In response to the above, Naugatuck Valley Community College seeks an evaluation consultant with:

* Demonstrable and recent experience evaluating STEM initiatives;
* Demonstrable and recent experience evaluating education projects targeted on minority students;
* Demonstrable and recent experience evaluating projects for Institutions of Higher Education; and
* Demonstrated technical expertise in conducting rigorous evaluations that meet What Work Clearinghouse (WWC) standards.  Having a certified WWC evaluator on staff would be a strong plus.

In addition to addressing the above requirements, proposals should include:

* Relevant qualifications and experience;
* Approach to evaluation (generally and for these specific initiatives);
* Staffing and management plans; and
* Budgets -- provide budget estimates for the entire scope (support on proposal development followed by the proposed evaluation) - all costs included.
* Three job references from similar engagements.
* Compensation: expressed as a not-to-exceed percentage of the annual grant. All costs shall be included in that percentage, including travel and expenses.

Any questions pertaining to the scope of services should be emailed to James Troup, Provost & Senior Dean of Administration at [jtroup@nvcc.commnet.edu](mailto:jtroup@nvcc.commnet.edu)

NOTE: Being the “low bidder” does not necessarily mean that an award will be made to that vendor. The purpose of the evaluation process is to determine the “best buy” for the College, taking into consideration selection criteria in the RFP and the factors spelled out by procedure and statute.

**Please submit your sealed bid, marked as such, to Lisa Anderson, NVCC, Room K-705, Waterbury, CT 06708 no later than 2:00pm on May 9, 2016.**