SCOPE & OVERVIEW

Sample Accreditation Evaluation Report

A detailed worked example of evidence, evaluation and practical improvement.

ILLUSTRATIVE RECIPIENT

Example STEM Learning Center

Community Makers Program · Ages 9-12

STEM ID: SAMPLE / NOT ISSUED

Defined scope

One fictional eight-session, in-person learning program at one example learning center. The sample covers the curriculum, facilitation, learner experience and improvement process described below. It does not extend recognition to additional sites, franchises or unrelated courses.

Executive summary

This worked example illustrates how an accreditation report connects program design with evidence of delivery. The Community Makers Program develops a small model community through structures, energy, transport and accessible-design challenges. Its strongest feature is a repeated cycle of asking questions, developing ideas, constructing a model, testing and explaining a revision. The example result of 92/100 represents a qualifying accreditation outcome, with recommendations to make learner progress and accessibility decisions easier to track. All observations refer to the fictional evidence register in this document; no real participants, site visits or measured outcomes are represented.

Reading this sample

Illustrative sample. The recipient, submission, evidence and result are fictional. This document demonstrates report presentation and is not an issued credential or an evaluation of a real organization, person or product.

Illustrative evaluation · 92 / 100

EVIDENCE REGISTER

The materials behind the findings

Each fictional evidence item has a defined role and a boundary. The identifiers connect this register to the category findings and worked analysis.

A1 Program map and eight session plans

Objectives connect structure, forces, measurement, simple circuits and community needs. Plans identify a question, activity, test and learner explanation for each session. A plan supports design quality; it does not establish consistent delivery.

A2 Facilitator and resource pack

Example preparation notes include concept explanations, equipment lists, role assignments, supervision expectations and a sample session checklist. Professional qualification documents and actual staffing would require verification.

A3 Illustrative learner portfolios

Three fictional portfolios show labelled sketches, measurement tables, photographs described in captions and before/after explanations of design changes. The portfolios demonstrate evidence format, not real learning gains.

A4 Access and participation plan

Alternative manipulation tools, large-print prompts and oral explanation options support participation while preserving the learning intention. Individual access needs would still need to be discussed in the delivery setting.

A5 Feedback and improvement log

A sample session log records unclear instructions, time pressure and changes to the following delivery cycle. Actions need named owners and later checks to show that changes worked.

METHODOLOGY

How the example is evaluated

The sample follows a traceable chain from the stated program scope to its design, implementation evidence and proposed improvements. Each conclusion distinguishes what a document establishes from what would require actual delivery records or verification.

01 Define the program and review boundary

The example concerns one eight-session program for ages 9-12 at one learning center. The review separates the program from the center's other services and identifies the curriculum version represented. This prevents evidence for a single course being treated as approval of the entire organization.

02 Check the submission as a connected set

A1 establishes intentions and progression; A2 explains how facilitators are expected to implement them. A3 provides the illustrative format for learner evidence, while A4 and A5 address participation and improvement. A strong claim should be supported by the relevant combination, not by a document title alone.

03 Distinguish design from implementation

Written plans can show educational coherence and readiness. Dated records and independently checkable information would be needed to substantiate actual delivery, staff qualifications or outcomes. Because this is a fictional sample, the apparent implementation records demonstrate presentation rather than prove that a program operated.

04 Make category reasoning explicit

The framework on page 4 gives the illustrative allocation. Pages 5-6 explain what supports each category, why the example does not receive all available points and what could strengthen the evidence. Categories are considered together; a high score in one does not remove another category's limitation.

05 Translate findings into an improvement cycle

The action plan assigns an example responsible role, an observable output and a completion check. These are suggested operational actions, not additional evidence claimed as already submitted. A later review would examine the actual changes and their effect rather than assume that writing a plan resolved the issue.

Evidence limits

No real site inspection, staff verification, attendance record or learner-outcome study is represented. The sample's three portfolios illustrate traceable documentation; their small, fictional set is not a representative impact study.

EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

The illustrative 92-point result

The six categories follow the retained Educational Program report model. The numbers below are illustrative allocations, not a claim that every application uses an identical detailed weighting or receives the same result.

STEM integration & curriculum | 28 / 30

Concepts are connected to purposeful challenges, with clearer links needed between some sessions.

Applied learning & critical thinking | 18 / 20

Learners compare designs and justify revisions; test conditions need more consistency.

Educator readiness & resources | 14 / 15

Preparation is practical and organised; substitute-facilitator guidance could be expanded.

Learner experience & accessibility | 14 / 15

Multiple participation routes are visible; access choices need a repeatable review process.

Community & collaboration | 9 / 10

Team roles and local design questions provide context; stakeholder feedback is limited.

Feedback & continuous improvement | 9 / 10

The log connects problems to actions; follow-up measures need clearer ownership.

TOTAL 92 / 100 · Minimum award threshold 82 · Best In STEM™ tier 95+

CRITERION FINDINGS

Learning design & application

Detailed reasoning for the first three categories.

STEM integration & curriculum | 28 / 30

EVIDENCE A1, A3

The session plans connect science ideas, measurement and engineering decisions to the community model. Learners revisit earlier concepts when a later challenge asks them to justify a structural or design choice.

The 28/30 allocation recognises that coherence while retaining room for a clearer progression map. Several links are explained within activities but are not explicitly tracked across the full sequence. The evidence supports a purposeful curriculum, not a claim that every learner mastered every concept.

Strengthening the evidence: Mark each concept as introduced, practised or assessed, and attach one appropriate learner-evidence prompt to each stage.

Applied learning & critical thinking | 18 / 20

EVIDENCE A1, A3

The bridge task requires prediction, comparison and revision against a defined goal. Retaining the initial design alongside the revised model makes the learner's decisions visible.

The 18/20 allocation reflects strong practical reasoning with an avoidable weakness in test comparability. If the load position, span or test method changes between designs, the result may not support the learner's explanation. Finishing a model alone is not treated as evidence of critical thinking.

Strengthening the evidence: Write a short common test protocol and ask the learner to name the feature changed and the conditions held constant.

Educator readiness & resources | 14 / 15

EVIDENCE A2, A5

Facilitator notes identify concepts, materials, supervision and prompts. A session checklist anticipates practical preparation rather than leaving every instructor to recreate the same decisions.

The 14/15 allocation recognises readiness but leaves a gap in continuity when a substitute or new facilitator leads the session. Written guidance also does not verify an actual instructor's qualification or understanding. A real submission should make those distinctions clear.

Strengthening the evidence: Add a brief onboarding example, a common misconception for each challenge and a handover note showing how to retain the learning goal when time or materials change.

CRITERION FINDINGS

Quality, access & improvement

Detailed reasoning for the remaining three categories.

Learner experience & accessibility | 14 / 15

EVIDENCE A2, A4

The access plan preserves the central question while offering alternatives for manipulating materials and communicating ideas. Oral explanation and larger components can reduce barriers without supplying the reasoning.

The 14/15 allocation reflects useful design intent. The missing element is a repeatable way to record whether an adjustment enabled participation and whether new barriers arose. The existence of an access plan should not be described as proof of universal accessibility.

Strengthening the evidence: Use a short planning-and-reflection check to document the barrier, chosen adjustment and later observation, keeping private learner information out of public reports.

Community & collaboration | 9 / 10

EVIDENCE A1, A3

Community problems give design tasks an audience beyond the exercise itself. Rotating team roles and shared explanations provide a structure for collaboration and help separate individual reasoning from the group product.

The 9/10 allocation recognises these practices while noting limited evidence from actual stakeholders. Imagining a user's need is a useful starting point but is different from collecting feedback from that user. A partnership name alone would not establish meaningful contribution.

Strengthening the evidence: Add a supervised user-feedback prompt or community response record and show how it changes a design or program decision.

Feedback & continuous improvement | 9 / 10

EVIDENCE A3, A5

The example log identifies an unclear instruction and a time-management issue, then connects them to changes in later planning. Learner records provide a possible way to check the effect.

The 9/10 allocation recognises the beginning of an improvement cycle. A clear action is present, but consistent ownership and an explicit follow-up measure are not. This distinction prevents a list of intentions from being treated as evidence that problems have been resolved.

Strengthening the evidence: Record the owner, next delivery date, evidence to collect and a concise conclusion about whether the change helped.

WORKED ANALYSIS

From activity to educational value

A closer look at the fictional submission shows how evidence supports a finding and where a claim needs to stay limited.

Curriculum coherence and disciplinary purpose

The bridge challenge introduces forces and measurement through a concrete problem: support a fixed load across a defined gap with limited materials. Learners record span and load, compare alternatives and explain how a change affects stability. A later transport challenge reuses measurement and introduces controlled comparison. These links make the program more than a sequence of craft activities. To strengthen coherence, the session map should identify which ideas are introduced, practised and assessed, so returning concepts become progressively more demanding. [A1, A3]

Facilitation that makes reasoning visible

Facilitator prompts ask learners what they predict, what evidence they collected and why they would change one feature. Example portfolios preserve an unsuccessful first attempt alongside the revised model, making iteration visible. Team roles provide opportunities to construct, measure, document and explain; rotating roles avoids equating participation with whichever learner handles the materials. A short calibration activity would help facilitators distinguish a copied explanation from a learner's own reasoning. [A2, A3]

Practical access and implementation

The sample access plan changes the route into the activity while retaining the challenge: a learner can dictate observations, use larger components or present an oral explanation. Materials are staged before each session, with task-specific supervision notes. These are useful implementation features, but the program should also record whether the adaptations enabled meaningful participation. A reusable session check can capture equipment readiness, likely barriers and the adjustments made without publishing private learner information. [A2, A4]

Assessment and improvement

The sample progress record follows planning, fair testing, use of evidence and explanation. It is stronger than relying only on attendance or a finished model. However, a rating such as "developing" needs a brief example to make judgments comparable across facilitators. The improvement log identifies an instruction problem and a subsequent change, but should also state what later evidence would show the change helped. No causal learning gains are inferred from the example records. [A3, A5]

IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Make the findings useful

These suggested actions illustrate how a recipient can respond to an evaluation. They are not changes claimed as already completed.

01 Map the learning progression

SUGGESTED OWNER: Curriculum lead

Create a single matrix linking each of the eight sessions to the concepts introduced, revisited and assessed. Keep the existing authentic challenges.

Evidence to retain: Updated sequence map plus a learner-evidence prompt for each session.

Completion check: A second facilitator can identify the expected progression and the purpose of each task without needing an oral explanation from its author.

02 Make comparisons dependable

SUGGESTED OWNER: Lead facilitator

Add a repeatable protocol for the bridge comparison: gap, material limit, load position and recording method. Model one fair and one unfair comparison.

Evidence to retain: Revised challenge card, test record and example facilitator prompt.

Completion check: Two facilitators describe the same conditions and can explain why a result supports, or fails to support, a learner's claim.

03 Close the improvement loop

SUGGESTED OWNER: Program coordinator

Add an owner and follow-up check to the feedback log, including an access-related issue. Review the observation after the next program cycle.

Evidence to retain: Action log with dated change, implementation note and evidence-based conclusion.

Completion check: Each recorded action has a clear status supported by an observation rather than being marked complete solely because the plan was written.

Strengths to preserve

- Purposeful challenges connect STEM concepts to a recognisable user or community need.
- Learner records preserve reasoning and revision rather than documenting only final products.
- Preparation and flexible participation options support consistent implementation.

DETERMINATION & NEXT STEPS

Read the result in context

An evaluation result applies to a defined subject and evidence set. It does not expand recognition beyond that scope.

Illustrative determination

For the scored accreditation pathway, the published minimum is 82/100. A 92-point example meets that threshold and does not reach the 95-point Best In STEM™ tier. Payment does not guarantee recognition. The sample allocation demonstrates report structure; the applicable review and evidence determine an actual decision.

The sample indicates a qualifying accreditation outcome for the defined Community Makers Program. Its core strengths are purposeful STEM integration, a visible design-and-revision process and practical facilitator preparation. The outstanding opportunities concern consistency, traceability and evidence of implementation; they do not disappear because the illustrative total is above the threshold.

Scope boundary

Unrelated courses, additional sites, individual educator qualifications, products used in sessions and measured learning gains are outside this fictional determination. A change of scope must be identified and evaluated through the appropriate process, rather than inferred from the name of the organization.

For an actual application

- Prepare the actual curriculum, instructor, implementation and learner-evidence materials requested in the current application.
- Identify the exact organization or program scope and use the accreditation registration pathway.
- If recognition is awarded, check the published record and communicate only the approved scope.

Andrew B. Raupp

Founder & Executive Director · signature shown for this illustrative sample

ARTWORK & VERIFICATION

Communicate the awarded scope

Keep the trustmark family, evaluated subject and official verification record together.

Use only the official Accredited artwork appropriate to the awarded scope. Keep the logo proportions and wording intact, make the recipient and scope clear, and use the official asset portal. A program's recognition must not imply that every product it uses or every educator it employs holds a separate credential.

An issued credential provides the recipient, awarded scope, original issue information, STEM ID and current status. Confirm those fields on the official STEM.org record before using artwork. This sample has no real STEM ID or active verification record. A program credential recognises the program; individual educator certification and product authentication are separate pathways.

Credential verification | **Official brand assets** | **Usage guidelines**