AMENDMENT #1:

March 28, 2024

This amendment extends the deadline for response to April 15. The RFP has also been updated to include the proposal evaluation section for reference.

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS: EVALUATION SERVICES

March 4, 2024

Issued by: ICAMR, Inc (dba BRIDG)

Contact: Carla Shows, Vice President for Grants and Contracts

                   cshows@gobridg.com

Introduction

BRIDG is the lead agency for a nine-organization partnership in Central Florida executing a U.S. National Science Foundation (NSF) Regional Innovation Engine grant award of $14.9 million over two years. As part of the requirements for the grant, BRIDG will contract with an external evaluator/external evaluation team to conduct a formative and summative evaluation of the Engine. Initial funding is for two (2) years (3/1/2024 – 2/28/2026), with the opportunity to apply for an additional eight (8) years if the Engine is successful in meeting/exceeding goals and objectives.

About BRIDG

BRIDG is a not-for-profit, public-private partnership specializing in digital, RF, and photonics interposer technology development coupled with advanced packaging capabilities. As an ITAR-certified and DMEA trust-ready supplier, BRIDG offers R&D expertise and a 200mm microelectronics fabrication facility geared toward system miniaturization, device integration, hardware security, and product manufacturing key to aerospace, defense, automotive, telecommunications, medical, and the IoT/AI revolution. Supported by Osceola County, Florida High Tech Corridor Council, imec, Orlando Economic Partnership, TEL, SUSS MicroTec, Siemens, and SkyWater Technology (Center for Neovation operator), BRIDG provides the physical infrastructure and collaborative process to connect challenges and

opportunities with solutions; "Bridging the Innovation Development Gap" making commercialization possible.

About the NSF Engines: Central Florida Semiconductor Innovation Engine

Led by BRIDG and anchored in Osceola County's 500-acre technology campus known as NeoCity, the NSF Engines: Central Florida Semiconductor Innovation Engine (the Engine) brings together major Central Florida research institutions, local government, nonprofits, and economic and workforce development partners to support the reshoring of the semiconductor advanced packaging industry. Initially, the Engine will support five use-inspired research projects at partnering institutions—University of Central Florida, University of Florida, and imec—with immediate impacts to advanced packaging, security, and heterogenous integrated microelectronics systems in extreme environments. Likewise, partners in economic development and workforce development contribute to this dynamic ecosystem, ensuring that Central Florida workers will have access to jobs with livable wages in the semiconductor industry regionally.

Finally, activities will focus on developing the greater semiconductor ecosystem at NeoCity. NSF Engines: Central Florida Semiconductor Innovation Engine includes a robust partnership of R&D, economic development, nonprofit, workforce development, and local government: BRIDG, CareerSource Central Florida, Florida High Tech Corridor, imec, the Orlando Economic Partnership, Osceola County, University of Central Florida, University of Florida, and Valencia College. The Engine aims to grow this effort, leading into additional funding years.

Evaluation Services Needed

The NSF Engines: Central Florida Semiconductor Innovation Engine (the "Engine") will require both formative and summative evaluation. An initial evaluation plan was included in the original proposal, but the External Evaluator will need to develop specific plans to implement the evaluation, develop/validate all evaluation instruments, collect and analyze the required data, and report analyses in user-friendly reports at least quarterly. Additionally, the evaluation team will be responsible to collaborate and coordinate with the NSF evaluation team on the larger NSF evaluation on behalf of the Engine.

Proposers should be able to provide both formative and summative evaluation activities for the nine-organization partnership and the Engine as a whole, as well as coordinate with the National Science Foundation Engine program team. Building off the preliminary evaluation plan in the proposal and any additional requirements as specified in the Grant Award Agreement, proposers will be required to develop and implement the evaluation services for the two-year project period. The evaluation plan should integrate best practices in large

consortia evaluations. Finally, the evaluation must include a data management plan that complies with NSF's requirements.

Proposal Guidelines

Proposals should follow the formatting below:

1. Executive Summary
2. Background Information about the firm/business
3. Qualifications of Staff/Team
   a. As part of this section, please indicate familiarity with open-sources program languages (such as R or Python).
4. Relevant Experience
5. Proposed Services, Anticipated Methodologies, and Deliverables
   a. As part of this section, proposers should include a plan for data management and protecting PII/sensitive/proprietary information
   b. As part of this section, please indicate the analytical software that will be used for qualitative and quantitative data analysis.
6. Pricing
   a. Please note: this is a fixed price contract and requires an itemized costing including the number of hours and rates.
7. References
8. Any terms and conditions for working with the firm

Selection Criteria

Criteria	Score
1. Responsiveness to the RFP	/25
2. Relevant past experience and performance, including familiarity with NSF external evaluation requirements and expectations	/25
3. Staff/team qualifications	/25
4. Testimonials, references from past clients	/10
5. Pricing	/15
TOTAL	/100

BRIDG reserves the right to award the contract to the vendor that represents the best value to the program, as determined by the BRIDG RFP team.

Timeline

To accommodate the two-year grant timeline, proposers should submit a PDF of their proposal to Carla Shows, cshows@gobridg.com by ~~April 1~~**. The deadline is extended to April 15.**

Selection and announcement will be made by ~~April 5~~**. Selection and announcement will be made by April 20.**

~~Contract would begin no later than~~ ~~April 30~~**. Contract will begin no later than May 15.**

Evaluation Plan

The analytical framework for the evaluation plan will allow for the NeoCity Engine leadership team to assess the goals, outcomes, activities, and deliverables of the Engine and to fully evaluate the successful Engine elements. The Engine will bid a qualified external evaluation center or team to conduct the evaluation activities and has budgeted adequately for this activity. A working group from the Engine will be convened to collaborative with the external evaluation team to operationalize and implement the evaluation.

In addition to the formative and summative evaluation of the Engine, the evaluation will also analyze the larger scope and impact of the NeoCity Engine, seeking to answer the following questions:

- What are the key features of successful on-shoring advanced manufacturing?
- In what ways does the Engines model increase U.S. global competitiveness and technology leadership in the research, development, manufacturing, and deployment of semiconductor technology?
- How can innovation intentionally be integrated into an advanced manufacturing sector so that could serve as a model for other industries or sectors?
- How can R&D and business and industry be appropriately integrated to create reciprocal feedback and interdependencies?
- How can workforce development and educational pathways prepare workers to engage in strong, high-quality jobs in the industry quickly and efficiently

Formative Evaluation Strategies: The Engine Program Managers will support the formative evaluation process, with the oversight of the Engine CEO. The Formative Evaluation will provide continual monitoring of Engine activities to ensure that the Engine is making progress and maintaining the established timetable. The Engine CEO and Program Managers will discuss any course corrections or changes needed to the formative elements of the Engine, especially as they relate to the foundational components and organizational structure, with the Engine Leadership Team to devise the best steps for correction.

Project Objective	Sample Formative Questions	Formative Data Element(s)
Partnership	Are appropriate partners integrated into the Engine? Were partners engaged in meaningful roles into the Engine? How are new partners introduced to and engaged with the Engine as meaningful partners?	# of partner organizations involved in the Engine at various levels # of new partners annually % attendance to weekly Engine calls

Project Objective	Sample Formative Questions	Formative Data Element(s)
R&D:	Are research partners and industry partners engaging reciprocally in the R&D process? Are NETs formed and deployed and collaborating? Are findings being disseminated within and through the Engine to relevant and interested stakeholders? Are outcomes and deliverables meeting expected timelines?	Research projects started/completed Publications in academic and industry journals # of student researchers (undergrad, grad levels) # NETs developed over course of Engine
Economic Development	Are appropriate economic development partners engaged in the Engine? How are companies, startups, businesses being engaged in the Engine?	# of interested/potential semiconductor-cluster businesses that chose the Central Florida region # of startup businesses that launch during Engine project period
Workforce Development	Are appropriate courses and programs being designed to meet the needs of industry? Are	# programs developed (certificate, AS, BS) # students enrolled Enrollment rates Completion rates
DEIA	Is DEIA part of conversations and considered as an essential part of project, program, activities development and deployment? Are strategies in place to engage underrepresented groups and increase accessibility into activities?	Representation rates across Engine projects and programs
Sustainability:	Is sustainability being adequately discussed and integrated at appropriate places throughout the Engine's implementation? What steps are being taken to consider the long-term sustainability of the Engine?	Plans created to continue the Engine's operation after funding Funding secured to sustain the Engine post-NSF funding
Broad-based Prosperity	Are there activities being included that focus on intentional economic growth opportunities? How are relevant and appropriate stakeholders made aware of these opportunities?	Broad-based Prosperity Scorecard

The external evaluation team will compose and provide a brief, written formative evaluation report recommendations to coordinate and strengthen the project activities, design, progress, and other elements as relevant. The CEO and PMs will review the formative report with the Leadership Team and develop an action plan to address specific recommendations under the advisement. The project team will report to the Governance Board on appropriate actions taken in response to the formative evaluation recommendations.

Summative Evaluation Strategies: The summative evaluation will assess the Engine's success in meeting its stated objectives, completing activities, producing deliverables, and meeting

stated outcomes. The PMs will support the evaluation component by coordinating any data collection among partners as well as providing relevant Engine records and data to the external evaluation team for data entry and analysis.

Objective	Evaluation Questions	Data Sources	Personnel and Partners Involved
Partnerships	Did the Engine create opportunities for more growth between partners and in what ways?	Qualitative interviews, surveys	EE, CEO, PMs, Partner organizations (various levels)
Technology and R&D	Which strategies were successful in driving innovative collaborative models of R&D between academic and industry? How effective was the design of the NETs for accomplishing innovative collaboration?	Content analysis of reports, data on studies/research projects conducted/ completed, qualitative interviews, surveys,	EE, CEO, PMs, NET members, UCF, UF, imec-USA, BRIDG
Business Development	Which strategies supported business development and encouraged more investment in the Central Florida semiconductor sector? How much capital was invested as it relates to the work of the Engine?	Qualitative interviews, surveys, economic development reports	EE, CEO, economic development partners
Workforce Development	Which strategies were successful in matching potential workers to the semiconductor field? Which strategies for workforce development worked well in helping students, workers gain relevant jobs in the semiconductor field?	Enrollment data, completion data, CareerSource program/training data, wages,	EE, CEO, Valancia College, CareerSource Central Florida
DEIA	Which strategies were successful in increasing representation in diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility? In what ways can DEIA continue to improve across the Engine?	Quantitative analysis of student representation, worker representation, Qualitative interviews, surveys	EE, CEO, PMs,
Sustainability	Which components are in place for sustainability beyond the scope of the proposal?	Engine records, relevant agreements	EE, CEO, PMs, Leadership team representatives
Inclusive Economic Growth	Were there strong increases in the region's Broad-based Prosperity score card (opportunities, capabilities, and access)?	OEP Broad-based Prosperity Scorecard data	EE, OEP, CareerSource

A full summative evaluation, using all relevant and appropriate quantitative and qualitative data, will assess whether and to what extent the NeoCity Engine met its objectives as well as explore the findings to the analytical framework questions. The summative report will be disseminated throughout the Engine.

To ensure that the evaluation is meeting established standards in evaluation, the

evaluation methodology, collected data, and preliminary findings will be reviewed annually. In

addition, the Engine working group will review data collection instruments to determine whether adjustments should be made.

Evaluation Activity	Year 1				Years 2-9				Year 10			
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Initial meeting/training	X											
Finalize specific evaluation instruments	X	X										
Review/review instruments					X				X			
Data collection (surveys, interviews, records)			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Data entry			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Data analysis/ interpretation			X	X			X	X			X	X
Ongoing/ad hoc monitoring		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Annual evaluation review				X				X				
Submit formative reports				X				X				
Submit summative draft report												X
Submit summative final report												X