



NON-INSTRUCTIONAL ACADEMIC STAFF REWARD AND RECOGNITION
APPLICATION/NOMINATION REVIEW FORM

NOMINEE

EVALUATOR INITIALS AND DATE

NOMINATOR

Assign a score to the selection criteria below (merit of the proposal) using the scale provided in the rubric.

Score input box

Application/nomination

Score input box

SCORE X 2

Introduction and connections to goals and objectives

Score input box

SCORE X 2

Significance of service

Score input box

Qualifications

Score input box

TOTAL POINTS (Maximum = 60)

Recommended Award

Dollar amount input box

\$

Comments:

Multiple horizontal lines for writing comments

OVERALL RATING

- Highly Recommend—Full Award (54-60 points, \$250)
Highly Recommend—Partial Award (48-53 points, \$150)
Recommend—Partial Award (42-47 points, \$50)
Recommend—Commendation only (41 points or less, Chancellor letter)
Do Not Recommend (applicant is NOT eligible)

**NON-INSTRUCTIONAL ACADEMIC STAFF REWARDS AND RECOGNITION
REVIEW/SELECTION CRITERIA/RUBRIC**

SCALE AND CRITERIA	1	5	10
APPLICATION [NOMINATION]	The nominee failed to submit a complete nomination/application form.	The nomination/application form is incomplete, exceeds page limitations, or was not submitted according to the posted deadline.	The nomination/application form is complete, adheres to all instructions, and was submitted according to the posted deadline.
INTRODUCTION AND CONNECTION TO GOALS AND OBJECTIVES [WEIGHTED X 2]	Author does not adequately introduce the nominee's service, no evidence-based justification for the award. Discussion of connection between the nominee's service and the goals / objectives of the department or university is not included.	Applicant does not adequately introduce the nominee, no evidence-based justification for a non-instructional academic staff reward and recognition award. Discussion of the nominee's service and departmental/university goals and / or objectives is incomplete. The author fails to make a compelling case.	The author provides a strong rationale for an award. The connection between the nominee's service and department, college, and/or university goals or objectives is clear and compelling.
SIGNIFICANT SERVICE [WEIGHTED X 2]	There is no discussion of nominee's "demonstrated significant quality service". It is unclear if the service qualifies as significant.	The discussion of nominee's "demonstrated quality service" is incomplete. There is little explanation for or evidence presented that the service qualifies as "significant."	Nominee's service is thoroughly described. It is clear that the nominee has made a significant contribution to the university above and beyond normal expectations.
QUALIFICATIONS	No evidence that the nominator is familiar with nominee's position, performance expectations, or goals of the department/university as relevant to the nominee's service.	The author provides some data indicating s/he is familiar with the service/performance expectations for the nominee and relevance to departmental or university goals. Information is incomplete or requires inference.	The nominator clearly describes service context including pertinent information related to the nominee's position description and performance expectations. A compelling case is presented and supported by detailed information and/or evidence.

MAXIMUM POINTS AVAILABLE

60