

New Staff Member of the Year and Staff Member of the Year

Going Above and Beyond in Respective Area

- **10 Points:** Initiates and completes multiple projects/tasks beyond job description with significant positive outcomes; demonstrates leadership and innovation in their field.
- **7 Points:** Takes on additional tasks and projects with noticeable improvements and outcomes; shows initiative and willingness to expand role.
- **4 Points:** Occasionally takes on tasks outside their job description; the outcome has a moderate impact.
- **1 Point:** Rarely or minimally engages in activities beyond what is required; impact of actions is minimal or unclear.

Collaboratively Contributes Meaningful Efforts through Teamwork

- **10 Points:** Played a pivotal role in a major group accomplishment or consistently enhances group performance through collaboration; recognized as a key team player.
- **7 Points:** Contributes significantly to group projects with good outcomes; engages in effective collaboration.
- **4 Points:** Participates in group efforts with some positive outcomes; cooperation is present but does not stand out.
- **1 Point:** Minimal contribution to group efforts; participation in collaboration is infrequent or lacks significant impact.

Demonstrated Efforts in Contributing a Meaningful Impact on the Institution

- **10 Points:** Serves on multiple committees or volunteers, leading initiatives/projects with a broad impact on the institution; acts as a change agent.
- **7 Points:** Actively involved in committees or volunteering, contributing to projects/initiatives with notable institutional impact.
- **4 Points:** Some involvement in institution-wide efforts; contributions are present but limited in scope.
- **1 Point:** Minimal or no involvement in committees, volunteering, or initiatives outside of direct role; little to no impact on the institution.

Demonstrated Characteristics of Dedication and Reliability

- **10 Points:** Consistently exceeds expectations in availability and commitment; highly dependable in all circumstances, including outside standard work hours.
- **7 Points:** Often available and reliable, showing a strong commitment to their role and team; occasionally goes beyond the call of duty.
- **4 Points:** Generally reliable and meets expectations for dedication; some instances of going beyond what is required.
- **1 Point:** Meets basic expectations for reliability and dedication; instances of exceeding expectations are rare or non-existent.

Written Nomination Content

- 10 Points: The argument is exceptionally compelling, systematically and persuasively presenting a case for the nominee's recognition. It integrates a comprehensive range of evidence and examples that clearly demonstrate the nominee's significant contributions and impact. The narrative is logical, well-reasoned, and effectively highlights the nominee's exceptional achievements in relation to the award criteria.
- 7 Points: The argument is strong and clear, presenting a solid case for the nominee with good use of evidence and examples. It outlines the nominee's contributions and impact in a logical and persuasive manner, though it may not provide as comprehensive a range of evidence as the highest tier. The reasoning is sound and aligns well with the award criteria.
- 4 Points: The argument is adequate but lacks the persuasive power of higher tiers, presenting a basic case for the nominee with limited evidence and examples. The narrative may lack depth in reasoning or breadth in covering the nominee's achievements. While it attempts to align with the award criteria, it falls short in compellingly demonstrating the nominee's impact.
- 1 Point: The argument is weak and fails to make a convincing case for the nominee. It provides minimal evidence and lacks persuasive reasoning, offering little to no detailed examples of the nominee's contributions. The narrative does not effectively align with the award criteria, making it difficult to see the nominee's impact or achievements.

Supervisor of the Year Award

Going Above and Beyond in Respective Area

- 10 Points: Leads transformative projects or initiatives within their unit that significantly surpass expected outcomes. Demonstrates visionary leadership and innovation, setting new standards of excellence.
- 7 Points: Guides their unit to achieve and exceed targets through creative solutions and proactive leadership, noticeably enhancing unit performance.
- 4 Points: Encourages and implements improvements within their area, achieving some enhanced outcomes, though with limited scope.
- 1 Point: Makes minimal attempts at innovation or improvement within their unit, with negligible impact on performance or outcomes.

Demonstrated Efforts in Contributing a Meaningful Effort within Team

- 10 Points: Cultivates a culture of excellence and cooperation, leading to high team morale and significant achievements. Actively mentors and develops team members, fostering a supportive and inclusive environment.
- 7 Points: Promotes effective collaboration and personal development within the team, leading to noticeable improvements in teamwork and individual growth.
- 4 Points: Takes steps to encourage team collaboration and support, with moderate success in enhancing team cohesion or individual development.
- 1 Point: Shows limited initiative in fostering team development or collaboration, with minimal impact on team dynamics or morale.

Demonstrated Efforts in Contributing a Meaningful Impact on the Institution

- 10 Points: Champions initiatives that have a transformative impact on the broader university community. Leads by example in institutional service, significantly enhancing the university's culture, policies, or public standing.
- 7 Points: Actively participates in and contributes to university-wide initiatives, playing a key role in projects or policies that benefit the institution.
- 4 Points: Involved in institutional efforts with some positive outcomes, though the impact is more localized or modest in scope.
- 1 Point: Engages minimally in activities beyond their immediate supervisory duties, with little discernible impact on the wider university community.

Demonstrated Characteristics of Dedication and Reliability

- 10 Points: Exemplifies unparalleled dedication and reliability, being consistently available and supportive to their team and peers, often beyond standard expectations. Acts as a role model in commitment and work ethic.
- 7 Points: Often demonstrates strong dedication and reliability, being a dependable leader for their team and contributing positively to their work environment.
- 4 Points: Generally reliable and shows dedication to their supervisory role, with occasional instances of going above the call of duty.
- 1 Point: Meets basic expectations for reliability and dedication as a supervisor, with rare instances of exceeding these expectations.

Written Nomination Content

- 10 Points: The argument is exceptionally compelling, systematically and persuasively presenting a case for the nominee's recognition. It integrates a comprehensive range of evidence and examples that clearly demonstrate the nominee's significant contributions and impact. The narrative is logical, well-reasoned, and effectively highlights the nominee's exceptional achievements in relation to the award criteria.
- 7 Points: The argument is strong and clear, presenting a solid case for the nominee with good use of evidence and examples. It outlines the nominee's contributions and impact in a logical and persuasive manner, though it may not provide as comprehensive a range of evidence as the highest tier. The reasoning is sound and aligns well with the award criteria.
- 4 Points: The argument is adequate but lacks the persuasive power of higher tiers, presenting a basic case for the nominee with limited evidence and examples. The narrative may lack depth in reasoning or breadth in covering the nominee's achievements. While it attempts to align with the award criteria, it falls short in compellingly demonstrating the nominee's impact.
- 1 Point: The argument is weak and fails to make a convincing case for the nominee. It provides minimal evidence and lacks persuasive reasoning, offering little to no detailed examples of the nominee's contributions. The narrative does not effectively align with the award criteria, making it difficult to see the nominee's impact or achievements.