**Evaluation Summary Rubric for Colorado 21st CCLC Subgrantees**

All 21st CCLC subgrantees are required to communicate local-level program evaluation results and make them readily available to the public, including posting annual results on the subgrantee’s website.This rubric is an optional tool that subgrantees can use to ensure that your evaluation summary is ready to be posted to your website or shared with your funders or other collaborative partners. CDE recommends that all dimensions of your summary meet “Fair” or “Excellent” expectations before your Summary is made available to the public. Please email your 21st CCLC Lead Consultant at CDE: Cody Buchanan (Buchanan\_C@cde.state.co.us) or Jacqueline Chavez (Chavez\_J@cde.state.co.us), if you have any questions.

| **Dimension** | **Needs Improvement** | **Fair** | **Excellent** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Program Overview** | Program overview is not included or contains only minimal information. Is missing key components about the program, such as mission, vision, goals, activities, students and families served.  | Overview contains some information about the program, such as its goals or vision, but is generic and would not easily differentiate your program from another similar program. Program information is outdated. | Overview contains current information about the program such as Program mission and vision, goals, activities, and the number of students and families served. Anyone reading the report would have a clear sense of the program. |
| **Program Evaluation: Research Questions**  | Research questions are not clearly laid out or answerable given available data. Data is presented with no framework through which to understand it. | Research questions are present but vague (e.g., success is not defined). Research questions are only partially responded to or are presented and then ignored. | Research questions are clearly stated and defined where necessary (e.g., “success” or “progress” are clearly described). All research questions are addressed. |
| **Program Evaluation: Measurement** | Measurement is not discussed. Data are presented with no information about how the data were obtained or analyzed. | Measurement is discussed briefly, but not in detail. Other programs would have a difficult time replicating the measurement techniques used. | Measurement techniques used to answer the research questions are clearly described, including: the names of the instruments used to collect data, the timeframe of evaluation, and the number of students and families assessed. Measurements could be replicated by other programs. It is clear how data were obtained. |
| **Program Results: Statements** | Results statements are not backed by data. Results are opinions. The answer/s to the research question/s are not provided.  | Results do not match research questions or bring up new data whose measurement is not discussed. Results contain some opinion. | Results match research questions. Results rely on analyses, not opinions. Results are easy to understand for a wide range of audiences. |
| **Program Results: Evaluation Visuals (e.g., graphs of results)**  | Evaluation visuals are not included or are difficult to understand without significant explanation. Data is presented in narrative form alone. | Visuals need some supplementary text to be fully understood. Color selection is haphazard so that visuals may not be accessible or easily parsed on different screens. Visuals are presented out of context and do not complement the narrative. | Evaluation visuals are easy to understand without reading the surrounding text. Color helps to tell the story and labels are applied where needed. Visuals are attractive and complement the narrative. Visuals are accessible (e.g., good contrast, contain alt text, use patterns in addition to where appropriate). |
| **Other Visuals** | No other visuals are included. | Visuals may be disconnected from the text or do not seem to fit the narrative. Visuals are hard to see (e.g., low contrast, pixelated). | Visuals and/or highlighted quotes from participating students or families are included and warm up the narrative. They fit the story being told and complement the text. |
| **Conclusion: Summary** | There is no summary, or the summary does not match the data presented. | The summary leaves out key components of the analysis or is too wordy, repeating findings in detail. | The summary concisely reiterates the main points of the data presented and highlights exciting findings. Reading the conclusion provides readers with a strong sense of the entirety of the evaluation contents. |
| **Conclusion: Recommendations** | No recommendations or next steps for continuous program improvement are provided.If provided, next steps for continuous improvement seem independent of the data presented. Future directions are too lofty, unattainable, or not able to be measured. | Next steps for continuous improvement are connected to the data presented. Future directions seem feasible, attainable, and able to be measured. At least one recommendation is provided. | Future directions are data-driven and based on the narrative of the evaluation. It is clear how the two are linked. Next steps for continuous improvement are connected to the data presented, actionable, time limited, and make sense considering the goals of the organization. Multiple recommendations are provided. |