

| APPLICATION RUBRIC                                   | Excellent (3)   | Acceptable/Good (2)   | Needs improvement/Fair (1)  |
|--|---|---|---|
| Youth Voice  | Youth are engaged in generating ideas, identifying outcomes, and decision-making during planning, implementation, and evaluation. Youth acquire knowledge and skills to enhance leadership and decision making and are involved in evaluating the quality and effectiveness of the service-learning experience.   | Teacher works with students in determining project based on quality standards. All students work collaboratively to develop a project plan and take leadership in carrying out tasks. Teacher helps to shape decisions throughout the process, but places primary emphasis on student voice.  | Teacher determines project and offers strong guidance in organizing and completing project tasks. Minimal collaboration. Students are allowed limited input into decisions. Students are not involved in evaluating quality and effectiveness of the service-learning experience.   |
| Reflection and Civic Responsibility                  | Participants think about complex community problems, alternative solutions and examine a variety of social and civic issues. Reflection occurs before, during and after the experience and includes a variety of verbal, written, artistic, and nonverbal activities to demonstrate changes in participants' knowledge, skill and/or attitudes.   | Project challenges students to identify, research and implement alternative solutions to community problems. Meaningful reflection is planned and integral to the project and is used to teach and/or reinforce core academic skills and/or content. Reflection includes some emphasis on higher order thinking skills, importance of community service, and conducted during and after service experiences.  | Basic reflection is at the end of the experience. Reflections limited to self-centered pros and cons of the service project; lack clear connections to skills being developed. Student reflections are a summary of events. Project could do more to challenge students to identify, research, and discuss solutions to social and civic issues.  |
| Progress Monitoring and Link to curriculum           | Data is used to improve experiences and progress toward goals. Evidence of progress is communicated to the broader community. Budget is well planned, researched, and incorporated into the curriculum. Participants learn to transfer knowledge and skills from one setting to another. Service-learning goals are clearly articulated. Students are prepared for service-related tasks in connection with skill instruction. Service learning as instructional strategy with content/service components integrated. IPARD framework is clearly defined for students and incorporated into the SL experience consistently. | Data collected provides a picture of student progress throughout the service-learning experience and shared with the community. Budget is well planned. Instruction assists students in completion of project, though link to curriculum may not be direct or intentional. Places more emphasis on service rather than learning. Students have few active applications of new skills or knowledge. IPARD process is explained to students; used on a limited basis. | Evidence of progress is shared only at the end of the project or not at all. Teacher and students follow implementation plans without collecting data to guide decisions. No clear connection between service and specific learning goals/outcomes. Budget lacks adequate planning. Application of new skills or knowledge not visible in service activities. Service is not intentionally connected to learning and acts as an enrichment activity or simply community service. IPARD process is minimally incorporated or not incorporated. |
| Partnership Quality                                  | Partnerships engage in frequent communication, establish a shared vision with common goals, and collaborate on implementation of action plans to meet specified goals. Partners share knowledge and understanding of school and community assets and needs and view each other as valued resources.   | Some ongoing communication and interaction with community partner is central to the project. Students work with partners to develop common goals. More opportunities could be provided to encourage students to see community members as collaborative partners and resources, not just recipients of the service.  | Little communication with the service partner. A shared vision and collaborative partnership have not been established or maintained. Service is not reciprocal or of mutual benefit to partner and students.   |
| Meaningful Service (includes duration and intensity) | Participants understand and connect their service experiences to the underlying societal issues being addressed. Solves a problem, meets a need; provides a long-term solution. Meets community needs through research conducted by the students. Direct interaction with the population being served is ongoing. Service learning is conducted during concentrated blocks of time over the course of several weeks or months.  | Project addresses a real need connected to a relevant issue and provides some direct contact with those being served in the community. Service project is by guessing community needs. Service learning is conducted over a significant period of time.   | Project is determined without a community needs assessment. Students have largely indirect contact with the population being served. Students do not understand their service experiences in the context of underlying societal issues being addressed. Community benefit and needs are secondary to what teacher and/or students want to do. Project is brief (less than two weeks).   |