

**Program of the Year Award Grading Rubric**

*rite the name of the school & program that you are grading here:* \_\_\_\_\_

Question	0	1	2	3	4	5
What is the overall quality of the award nomination? (0-5)	Minimal effort has been given to complete nomination; nomination is off topic.	The nomination has little detail; responses are very brief; poorly written; no concrete details; many grammatical errors.	The nomination contains some detail, but is too brief; does not provide a lot of concrete details; many grammatical errors.	The nomination is appropriate length and well worded; provides concrete details, but does not address all parts of the nomination; few grammatical errors.	The nomination is well put together; appropriate length; missing some minor details; has minor grammatical errors.	The nomination is thorough; appropriate length; provide both major and minor details; no grammatical errors.
What is the extent of the impact left on campus, or an individual, through the nominated event? (0-3)	The nominated event has left no meaningful impact.	The impact left is unclear or very minor.	The impact left is not clear to its full extent or extent of the impact is moderate.	The impact left affects an individual or campus community in a substantial, meaningful, way that has clearly left the person/community changed for the	X	X
How well was the event planned and implemented? (0-4)	Nomination did not speak to the event planning and/or implementation.	Nomination spoke to the event planning and implementation, but details are lacking and the nomination is unclear about this topic.	Nomination spoke to only the event planning OR implementation, but not both topics. Some details are provided, but not all.	Nomination spoke to both the event planning and implementation. Major details are provided, but lacking the minor details.	Nomination spoke to both the event planning and implementation. Major and minor details are provided, making this program easy to replicate at another campus.	X
To what extent was the nominated event evaluated? Did the nomination speak to the successes, challenges of the event? (0-3)	Nomination did not speak to the event evaluation or no evidence was provided that the event was evaluated.	Nomination did speak to the event being evaluated, but did not share any of the results, successes, or challenges learned from the event.	Nomination did speak to the event being evaluated, and results were shared within the nomination as well. However, nomination did not speak to any learned successes or challenges.	Nomination did speak to the event being evaluated, including details about the results, learned successes, and learned challenges.	Nomination did speak to the event being evaluated, including details about the results, learned successes, and learned challenges. Nomination went above by sharing how the gathered feedback would be used for future	X

**Outstanding Commitment to Diversity Award Grading Rubric**

*Write the name of the school & program that you are grading here:*

Question	0	1	2	3	4	5
What is the overall quality of the award nomination? (0-5)	Minimal effort has been given to complete nomination; nomination is off topic.	The nomination has little detail; responses are very brief; poorly written; no concrete details; many grammatical errors.	The nomination contains some detail, but is too brief; does not provide a lot of concrete details; many grammatical errors.	The nomination is appropriate length and well worded; provides concrete details, but does not address all parts of the nomination; few grammatical errors.	The nomination is well put together; appropriate length; missing some minor details; has minor grammatical errors.	The nomination is thorough; appropriate length; provide both major and minor details; no grammatical errors.
What is the extent of the impact left on campus, or an individual, through the nominated event? (0-3)	The nominated event has left no meaningful impact.	The impact left is unclear or very minor.	The impact left is not clear to its full extent or extent of the impact is moderate.	The impact left affects an individual or campus community in a substantial, meaningful, way that has clearly left the person/community changed for the	X	X
Event addressed key areas of Diversity & Inclusion (ex. ethnic identification/race, gender, gender identity, disability, sexual orientation, age, religion, mic status) (0-4)	Event provided no effort to address key areas and/or no evidence provided that event addressed key areas.	Event provided minimal effort to address key areas and/or little evidence provide that event addressed key areas.	Event provided moderate effort to address key areas and/or some minor details are given to provide evidence that event addressed key areas.	Event provided substantial effort to address key areas and/or nomination provides some details, but is lacking concrete, in-depth, evidence that event addressed key areas.	Event provided substantial effort to address key areas; full, concrete, details are provided to show evidence that event addressed key areas.	X
What is the extent that participants awareness was increased and education occurred because of this event? Evidence could include charts, a, etc. (0-3)	No evidence was provided that participants awareness increased, and/or that education occurred.	Minimal evidence was provided that participants awareness increased, and that education occurred.	Moderate evidence was provided that participants awareness increased and that education occurred.	Substantial evidence was provided that participants awareness increased and that education occurred.	X	X

**Outstanding Program Series Award Grading Rubric**

*rite the name of the school & program that you are grading here:*

Question	0	1	2	3	4	5
What is the overall quality of the award nomination? (0-5)	Minimal effort has been given to complete nomination; nomination is off topic.	The nomination has little detail; responses are very brief; poorly written; no concrete details; many grammatical errors.	The nomination contains some detail, but is too brief; does not provide a lot of concrete details; many grammatical errors.	The nomination is appropriate length and well worded; provides concrete details, but does not address all parts of the nomination; few grammatical errors.	The nomination is well put together; appropriate length; missing some minor details; has minor grammatical errors.	The nomination is thorough; appropriate length; provide both major and minor details; no grammatical errors.
What is the extent of the impact left on campus, or an individual, through the nominated event series? (0-3)	The nominated event series has left no meaningful impact.	The impact left is unclear or very minor.	The impact left is not clear to its full extent or extent of the impact is moderate.	The impact left affects an individual or campus community in a substantial, meaningful, way that has clearly left the person/community	X	X
To what extent was the event series well executed, organized, and planned? (0-3)	Event series was not well executed, organized, or planned. No evidence provided in the nomination that proves otherwise.	Nomination provides minimal evidence to support that the event series was well executed, organized, or planned. Minor details may be provided, but lacks concrete details.	Nomination provides moderate evidence that the event series was well executed, organized, or planned. Minor details are provided, but lacks some concrete details.	Nomination provides substantial evidence that the event series was well executed, organized, and planned. Both minor and major concrete details are provided.	X	X
To what extent did the program series build upon each event? (Where the individual programs connected to each other way?) (0-4)	No evidence was provided that the program series' events built upon each other.	Minimal evidence was provided that the program series' events built upon each other.	Moderate evidence was provided that the program series' events built upon each other. Evidence of how.	Substantial evidence was provided that the program series' events built upon each other.	Substantial evidence was provided that the program series' events built upon each other. Additionally, evidence of how each program built upon each other was	X

**Best Collaborative Program Award Grading Rubric**

*Write the name of the school & program that you are grading here:*

Question	0	1	2	3	4	5
What is the overall quality of the award nomination? (0-5)	Minimal effort has been given to complete nomination; nomination is off topic.	The nomination has little detail; responses are very brief; poorly written; no concrete details; many grammatical errors.	The nomination contains some detail, but is too brief; does not provide a lot of concrete details; many grammatical errors.	The nomination is appropriate length and well worded; provides concrete details, but does not address all parts of the nomination; few grammatical errors.	The nomination is well put together; appropriate length; missing some minor details; has minor grammatical errors.	The nomination is thorough; appropriate length; provide both major and minor details; no grammatical errors.
What is the extent of the impact left on campus, or an individual, through the nominated event? (0-3)	The nominated event has left no meaningful impact.	The impact left is unclear or very minor.	The impact left is not clear to its full extent or extent of the impact is moderate.	The impact left affects an individual or campus community in a substantial, meaningful, way that has clearly left the person/community	X	X
To what extent was the collaborative program well executed, organized, and planned? (0-3)	Collaborative event was not well executed, organized, or planned. No evidence provided in the nomination that proves otherwise.	Nomination provides minimal evidence to support that the collaborative event was well executed, organized, or planned. Minor details may be provided, but lacks concrete details.	Nomination provides moderate evidence that the collaborative event was well executed, organized, or planned. Minor details are provided, but lacks some concrete details.	Nomination provides substantial evidence that the collaborative event was well executed, organized, and planned. Both minor and major concrete details are provided.	X	X
To what extent did the nomination speak to the collaborative efforts between the organization(s) and/or department involved? (0-4)	No evidence was provided that the event was a collaborative effort.	Minimal evidence was provided that the event was a collaborative effort. Other organizations and/or departments involved are not mentioned in the nomination.	Moderate evidence was provided that the event was a collaborative effort. Other organizations and/or departments involved are vaguely mentioned, but no concrete details are provided.	Substantial evidence was provided that the event was a collaborative effort. Other organizations and/or departments involved are mentioned, but only minor details provided.	Substantial evidence was provided that the event was a collaborative effort. Other organizations and/or departments involved are not only mentioned; details are provided on what each organization/department did to execute the event.	X

**Best Community Program Award Grading Rubric**

*Write the name of the school & program that you are grading here:*

Question	0	1	2	3	4	5
What is the overall quality of the award nomination? (0-5)	Minimal effort has been given to complete nomination; nomination is off topic.	The nomination has little detail; responses are very brief; poorly written; no concrete details; many grammatical errors.	The nomination contains some detail, but is too brief; does not provide a lot of concrete details; many grammatical errors.	The nomination is appropriate length and well worded; provides concrete details, but does not address all parts of the nomination; few grammatical errors.	The nomination is well put together; appropriate length; missing some minor details; has minor grammatical errors.	The nomination is thorough; appropriate length; provide both major and minor details; no grammatical errors.
What is the extent of the impact left on the on-campus and the off-campus community from the nominated event? (0-3)	The nominated event has left no meaningful impact.	The impact left is unclear or very minor.	The impact left is not clear to its full extent or extent of the impact is moderate.	The impact left affects the on and off campus community in a substantial, meaningful, way that has clearly left the person/community changed for the better.	X	X
To what extent was the community program well executed, organized, and planned? (0-3)	Community event was not well executed, organized, or planned. No evidence provided in the nomination that proves otherwise.	Nomination provides minimal evidence to support that the community event was well executed, organized, or planned. Minor details may be provided, but lacks concrete details.	Nomination provides moderate evidence that the community event was well executed, organized, or planned. Minor details are provided, but lacks some concrete details.	Nomination provides substantial evidence that the community event was well executed, organized, and planned. Both minor and major concrete details are provided.	X	X

<p>To what extent was the local, off-campus community as a benefactor, sponsor, or collaborator incorporated into the program? (0-4)</p>	<p>No evidence was provided that the local, off-campus community as a benefactor, sponsor, or collaborator incorporated into the program.</p>	<p>Minimal evidence was provided that the local, off-campus community as a benefactor, sponsor, or collaborator incorporated into the program.</p>	<p>Moderate evidence was provided that the local, off-campus community as a benefactor, sponsor, or collaborator incorporated into the program. The specific community entities are vaguely mentioned, but no cocreate details are provided.</p>	<p>Substantial evidence was provided that the local, off-campus community as a benefactor, sponsor, or collaborator incorporated into the program. The specific community entities are mentioned, but only minor details are provided.</p>	<p>Substantial evidence was provided that the local, off-campus community as a benefactor, sponsor, or collaborator incorporated into the program. The specific community entities are not only mentioned; details are provided on how each community entity were incorporated into the program.</p>	<p>X</p>
--	---	--	--	--	--	----------

**Best Sustainable Program Award Grading Rubric**

*rite the name of the school & program that you are grading here:*

Question	0	1	2	3	4	5
<p>What is the overall quality of the award nomination? (0-5)</p>	<p>Minimal effort has been given to complete nomination; nomination is off topic.</p>	<p>The nomination has little detail; responses are very brief; poorly written; no concrete details; many grammatical errors.</p>	<p>The nomination contains some detail, but is too brief; does not provide a lot of concrete details; many grammatical errors.</p>	<p>The nomination is appropriate length and well worded; provides concrete details, but does not address all parts of the nomination; few grammatical errors.</p>	<p>The nomination is well put together; appropriate length; missing some minor details; has minor grammatical errors.</p>	<p>The nomination is thorough; appropriate length; provide both major and minor details; no grammatical errors.</p>
<p>What is the extent of the impact left on campus, or an individual, through the nominated event? (0-3)</p>	<p>The nominated event has left no meaningful impact.</p>	<p>The impact left is unclear or very minor.</p>	<p>The impact left is not clear to its full extent or extent of the impact is moderate.</p>	<p>The impact left affects an individual or campus community in a substantial, meaningful, way that has clearly left the person/community</p>	<p>X</p>	<p>X</p>

To what extent was the program well executed, organized, and planned? (0-3)	Community event was not well executed, organized, or planned. No evidence provided in the nomination that proves otherwise.	Nomination provides minimal evidence to support that the community event was well executed, organized, or planned. Minor details may be provided, but lacks concrete details.	Nomination provides moderate evidence that the community event was well executed, organized, or planned. Minor details are provided, but lacks some concrete details.	Nomination provides substantial evidence that the community event was well executed, organized, and planned. Both minor and major concrete details are provided.	X	X
To what extent were the participants educated on sustainability, leading to an increased awareness? (0-4)	No evidence was provided that the participants were educated on sustainably or that the participants had any increased awareness of sustainability.	Minimal evidence was provided that the participants were educated on sustainably or that the participants had any increased awareness of sustainability.	Moderate evidence was provided that the participants were educated on sustainably or that the participants had any increased awareness of sustainability.	Substantial evidence was provided that the participants were educated on sustainably or that the participants had any increased awareness of sustainability.	X	X

**The Markley Award Grading Rubric**

*Write the name of the award you are grading here:* \_\_\_\_\_

*Write the name of the individual nominated here:* \_\_\_\_\_

Question	0	1	2	3	4	5
What is the overall quality of the award nomination materials (nomination statement & letter(s) of support)? (0-5)	Minimal effort has been given to provide complete nomination materials; nomination materials is off topic.	The nomination materials has little detail; responses are very brief; poorly written; no concrete details; many grammatical errors.	The nomination materials contains some detail, but is too brief; does not provide a lot of concrete details; many grammatical errors.	The nomination materials are appropriate length and well worded; provides concrete details, but does not address all parts of the nomination; few grammatical errors.	The nomination materials are well put together; appropriate length; missing some minor details; has minor grammatical errors.	The nomination materials are thorough; appropriate length; provide both major and minor details; no grammatical errors.

<p>What is the extent of the impact that the nominated individual has left on the field of student development, student activities, or the entertainment industry and NACA Central? The impact includes continued involvement &amp; contribution to student activities and nominee is regarded as a positive role model to students, professional staff, and associates (0-4)</p>	<p>The nominated individual has left no meaningful impact, OR the nomination does not speak to the impact.</p>	<p>The impact left is unclear or very minor.</p>	<p>The impact left is not clear to its full extent or extent of the impact is moderate.</p>	<p>The impact left affects the professional field <u>OR</u> NACA Central region in a substantial, meaningful, way that has clearly left the person/community changed for the better.</p>	<p>The impact left affects the professional field <u>AND</u> NACA Central region in a substantial, meaningful, way that has clearly left the person/community changed for the better.</p>	<p>X</p>
<p>To what extent has the nominated candidate met the 3 year minimum requirement of full-time employment in the field of student development, student activities, or the entertainment industry? (0-5)</p>	<p>The nominated individual has not been employed full-time in the field of student development, student activities, or the entertainment industry, OR the nomination does not speak to the length of the nominated individual's employment</p>	<p>The nominated individual has been employed full-time in the field of student development, student activities, or the entertainment industry, but does not meet the 3 year minimum requirement.</p>	<p>The nominated individual has been employed full-time for the minimum of 3 years in the field of student development, student activities, or the entertainment industry.</p>	<p>The nominated individual has been employed full-time for 4 to 8 years in the field of student development, student activities, or the entertainment industry.</p>	<p>The nominated individual has been employed full-time for 9 to 14 years in the field of student development, student activities, or the entertainment industry.</p>	<p>The nominated individual has been employed full-time for 15+ years in the field of student development, student activities, or the entertainment industry.</p>



What is the extent of the nominated candidate's involvement in NACA (both regional and national) and other regional and/or national organizations? (0-4)	No evidence was provided that the nominated individual is involved in NACA Central, NACA National, or other regional and national organizations.	Minimal evidence was provided that nominated individual is involved in NACA Central, NACA National, or other regional and national organizations.	Moderate evidence was provided that nominated individual is involved in NACA Central, NACA National, or other regional and national organizations.	Substantial evidence was provided that nominated individual is involved in NACA Central and NACA National, but no evidence provided that nominated individual is active in other regional and national organizations.	Substantial evidence was provided that nominated individual is involved in NACA Central, NACA National, and other regional and national organizations.	X
---	--	---	--	---	--	---

**Individual Awards Grading Rubric**

*Write the name of the award you are grading here:* \_\_\_\_\_

*Write the name of the individual nominated here:* \_\_\_\_\_

Question	0	1	2	3	4	5
What is the overall quality of the award nomination materials (nomination statement & letter(s) of support)? (0-5)	Minimal effort has been given to provide complete nomination materials; nomination materials is off topic.	The nomination materials has little detail; responses are very brief; poorly written; no concrete details; many grammatical errors.	The nomination materials contains some detail, but is too brief; does not provide a lot of concrete details; many grammatical errors.	The nomination materials are appropriate length and well worded; provides concrete details, but does not address all parts of the nomination; few grammatical errors.	The nomination materials are well put together; appropriate length; missing some minor details; has minor grammatical errors.	The nomination materials are thorough; appropriate length; provide both major and minor details; no grammatical errors.
To what extent does the individual nominated meet the award criteria? (0-5)	The nominated individual does not meet the award criteria OR the nomination does not speak if the nominated individual meets all the award criteria.	The nominated individual meets 25% or less of the stated award criteria.	The nominated individual meets at minimum 50% of the stated award criteria.	The nominated individual meets at minimum 75% of the stated award criteria.	The nominated individual meets all award criteria as stated, but late in-depth details of how criteria is met.	The nominated individual meets all award criteria as stated. Nomination materials provide in-depth details of how criteria is met.

<p>What is the extent of the impact that the nominated individual has left on their campus, another individual, or the field of student development/student activities? (0-3)</p>	<p>The nominated individual has left no meaningful impact, OR the nomination does not speak to the impact.</p>	<p>The impact left is unclear or very minor.</p>	<p>The impact left is not clear to its full extent or extent of the impact is moderate.</p>	<p>The impact left on the nominated individual's campus, another individual, or the field of student development/student activities is in a substantial and meaningful way, that has clearly left the person/community changed for the better.</p>	<p>X</p>	<p>X</p>
<p>What is the extent of the nominated candidate's involvement in NACA (either regional or national) and on their campus? (0-3)</p>	<p>No evidence was provided that the nominated individual is involved in NACA or on their campus.</p>	<p>Minimal evidence was provided that nominated individual is involved in NACA or on their campus.</p>	<p>Moderate evidence was provided that nominated individual is involved in NACA or on their campus.</p>	<p>Substantial evidence was provided that nominated individual is involved in NACA or on their campus.</p>	<p>X</p>	<p>X</p>