

Youth Program Services Roster Application Rubric

Section	1 – Inadequate	2 – Limited	3 – Adequate	4 – Strong
Program/Service Overview (2.1–2.6)	<p>2.3: Program experience/core activities unclear; no session structure detail.</p> <p>2.4: Implementation model missing or not feasible in SPS context.</p> <p>2.5: Setting not selected and/or schedule/dosage absent (no frequency/minutes/duration).</p> <p>2.6: Service location(s) not selected or inconsistent.</p>	<p>2.3: Some description of activities, but limited detail (unclear lesson/session structure, group size, materials/curriculum).</p> <p>2.4: Model stated (e.g., after-school), but missing key parameters (how students served, grouping, operational details).</p> <p>2.5: Setting selected, but schedule incomplete (missing 2+ of: days/week, minutes/session, duration/timeframe).</p> <p>2.6: Location selected but unclear how it fits the model.</p>	<p>2.3: Clear description of student experience and core activities; includes basic session structure some operational detail (group size or curriculum/materials/tools).</p> <p>2.4: Implementation model is appropriate to SPS and mostly specified (push-in/pull-out/after-school/small group/1:1).</p> <p>2.5: Setting selected; schedule includes most dosage elements (days/week + minutes/session + duration/timeframe; minor gaps ok).</p> <p>2.6: Service location(s) selected and coherent.</p>	<p>2.3: Detailed student experience, core activities, session structure (group size, curriculum/materials/tools clearly identified).</p> <p>2.4: Implementation model fully specified and feasible (delivery format, grouping, staffing pattern, how students participate).</p> <p>2.5: Setting(s) and complete dosage provided (days/week, minutes/session, start–end timeframe; any seasonal variation noted).</p> <p>2.6: Locations align to the model and schedule; feasibility assumptions are explicit.</p>
Student Populations & Equity (3.1–3.4)	<p>3.2: Student count missing/unrealistic.</p> <p>3.3: Populations served missing or unclear.</p> <p>3.4: Equity narrative absent or purely generic; SOCFEJ not addressed.</p>	<p>3.2: Student count given but lacks context (per session vs per year).</p> <p>3.3: Populations listed but vague (“all students”) without targeting/justification.</p> <p>3.4: Mentions equity and barriers, but strategies are generic</p>	<p>3.2: Student estimate is plausible and defined (per site/year).</p> <p>3.3: Populations served are identified with some specificity (including focus groups where applicable).</p> <p>3.4: Equity narrative includes concrete strategies to address at least 2 barriers and references SOCFEJ intentionally.</p>	<p>3.2: Student estimate is specific and operationally credible</p> <p>3.3: Populations served are clearly defined</p> <p>3.4: Strong equity plan with specific, actionable strategies; equity is embedded, not additive.</p>
Alignment with SPS Goals & (4.1–4.3)	<p>4.1: No meaningful connection to SPS goals/guardrails.</p> <p>4.2: CSIP alignment absent; no example CSIP used.</p> <p>4.3: Outcomes missing</p>	<p>4.1: Vague alignment (“supports student success”) with limited detail.</p> <p>4.2: General CSIP mention without a concrete example or action-plan linkage.</p> <p>4.3: Outcomes listed but are broad, not measurable, or missing key elements</p>	<p>4.1: Identifies which goals/guardrails are supported with some explanation of how.</p> <p>4.2: Provides plausible CSIP alignment and uses an example CSIP, though action-plan linkage may be somewhat general.</p> <p>4.3: Lists 2–4 outcomes that are mostly SMARTIE</p>	<p>4.1: Specific alignment to SPS goals/guardrails with clear logic linking program activities to priorities.</p> <p>4.2: Uses an example CSIP and clearly connects the program to CSIP goals <i>and</i> action plan steps</p> <p>4.3: 2–4 strong SMARTIE outcomes</p>
Communication and Engagement (5.1–5.2)	<p>5.1: No plan for school coordination; unclear who communicates with whom and when.</p> <p>5.2: Family engagement missing where relevant.</p>	<p>5.1: Coordination described generally but lacks cadence and medium. Roles unclear.</p> <p>5.2: Family engagement mentioned but vague; unclear how families are informed/involved.</p>	<p>5.1: Coordination plan is workable and includes who communicates, general frequency, and typical methods.</p> <p>5.2: Family engagement described at a basic level (what families receive/how they participate)</p>	<p>5.1: Clear communication protocol with roles, cadence, channels, and what is communicated</p> <p>5.2: Family engagement is specific and accessible (language considerations, multiple touchpoints, meaningful involvement)</p>
Evidence of Effectiveness (6.1–6.5)	<p>6.1: No credible evidence base; claims are generic (“we help students succeed”) with no</p>	<p>6.1: Mentions research/frameworks but connection to program design is</p>	<p>6.1: Evidence base is plausible and connected to program design</p> <p>6.2: Shows a credible track record with at</p>	<p>6.1: Clear evidence-informed model with specific research/frameworks</p> <p>6.2: Strong track record with multiple</p>

Section	1 – Inadequate	2 – Limited	3 – Adequate	4 – Strong
	<p>specifics. 6.2: No outcomes/results provided, or metrics are irrelevant/unverifiable. 6.3: No supporting documentation despite major claims (when applicable). 6.5: References missing or incomplete</p>	<p>unclear. 6.2: Provides minimal evidence (anecdotes or one weak metric) OR results without context (who/when/where). 6.3: Few/no attachments; evidence remains thin. 6.5: References provided but are not clearly positioned to speak to impact or reliability.</p>	<p>least 1–2 concrete metrics from prior implementations <i>or</i> a credible internal evaluation approach (pre/post, surveys, progress monitoring). Provides enough context to interpret results (who/where/when). 6.3: Attachments provided when helpful OR narrative is sufficiently specific to support review. 6.5: At least two references with complete contact info; at least one can speak to performance with schools/students.</p>	<p>outcome metrics aligned to program goals 6.3: Attachments substantiate results 6.5: Strong references (preferably school/district leaders) that can validate both impact and implementation reliability.</p>
<p>Staffing & Qualifications (7.1–7.3)</p>	<p>7.1: Roles/team structure missing or unclear; staffing appears insufficient. 7.2: Qualifications missing or clearly misaligned to service type. 7.3: Training/support absent.</p>	<p>7.1: Roles listed but unclear staffing levels or how team supports sites. 7.2: Qualifications provided but minimal detail or uneven alignment across roles. 7.3: Training described generally; little ongoing support/supervision.</p>	<p>7.1: Team structure is understandable and plausible for program delivery. 7.2: Qualifications generally match roles and services. 7.3: Training and support described</p>	<p>7.1: Clear staffing model (roles, responsibilities, supervision) aligned to scale and setting. 7.2: Strong qualifications clearly linked to work. 7.3: Robust training plan and ongoing coaching/supervision.</p>
<p>Data, Evaluation & Reporting (8.1–8.4)</p>	<p>8.1: No meaningful data plan; does not specify implementation data or outcome measures. 8.2: No clear process for reviewing data or improving program while running. 8.3: Reporting to SPS not described 8.4: Privacy/security not addressed or raises concerns (unclear handling of student information).</p>	<p>8.1: Mentions data in general terms but lacks specificity. May list only outcome data with no implementation/dosage tracking, or only participation with no outcomes alignment. 8.2: Data use is described broadly with no cadence or examples of adjustments. 8.3: Reporting cadence/format unclear or minimal; unclear what SPS will receive. 8.4: Privacy referenced but lacks practical detail</p>	<p>8.1: Identifies at least some implementation data and at least one outcome indicator aligned to Section 4.3 8.2: Describes a workable continuous improvement loop (who reviews, how often, general examples of adjustments). 8.3: Provides a basic reporting plan to SPS, as well as cadence and product type 8.4: Provides a basic privacy/security approach appropriate for the level of data collected; FERPA awareness noted where applicable.</p>	<p>8.1: Clear, operational data plan that includes implementation and outcome data, tied directly to SMARTIE outcomes (4.3). 8.2: Concrete continuous improvement process with defined cadence and decision rules. 8.3: Specific deliverables to SPS: what reports, to whom, cadence (e.g., quarterly + end-of-year), and format 8.4: Clear privacy/security practices, appropriate to student-level vs aggregate reporting.</p>