

## Staff Leadership Excellence Award Scoring Rubric

### Award Description

The **Leadership Excellence Award** recognizes outstanding leadership within a health professions academic institution. This award celebrates staff who have demonstrated exceptional leadership qualities, inspiring and guiding their colleagues, students, or institutional initiatives with vision, integrity, and a commitment to excellence.

### Instructions for Reviewers:

Review each nomination using the criteria below, scoring each area on a scale of 1-5 (1 = Does not meet expectations, 5 = Exceeds expectations). Use the comment sections to support your scores. Total possible points: 45. For team awards, apply the criteria to the team's collective achievements.

### Section 1: Vision (5 points)

- Criteria: Consider the following:
  - Demonstrates a clear and compelling vision for their team, department, or institution.
  - Inspires and motivates colleagues and students toward a shared goal.
  - Champions innovation and continuous improvement.

- 5 = Exceeds expectations
- 3 = Meets expectations
- 1 = Does not meet expectations

Score: \_\_\_\_ / 5

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

### Section 2: Mentorship (5 points)

- Criteria: Consider the following:
  - Actively supports and mentors students, faculty, or staff.
  - Provides guidance that fosters professional growth and development.
  - Creates an inclusive and supportive environment for colleagues and learners.

- 5 = Exceeds expectations
- 3 = Meets expectations
- 1 = Does not meet expectations

Score: \_\_\_\_ / 5

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

### Section 3: Collaboration (5 points)

- Criteria: Consider the following:
  - Encourages teamwork and interdisciplinary collaboration.
  - Builds strong relationships across the university to advance institutional goals, mission and values.
  - Resolves conflicts effectively and promotes a positive workplace culture.

- 5 = Exceeds expectations

- 3 = Meets expectations

- 1 = Does not meet expectations

Score: \_\_\_\_ / 5

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

### Section 4: Ethics (5 points)

- Criteria: Consider the following:
  - Leads with honesty, transparency, and accountability.
  - Models ethical decision-making in academic, administrative, or operational settings.

- 5 = Exceeds expectations

- 3 = Meets expectations

- 1 = Does not meet expectations

Score: \_\_\_\_ / 5

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

### Section 5: Impact (5 points)

- Criteria: Consider the following:
  - Demonstrates measurable improvements in educational programs, institutional programs, or workplace culture.
  - Has a lasting impact on students, faculty, or staff beyond their immediate role.

- 5 = Exceeds expectations

- 3 = Meets expectations

- 1 = Does not meet expectations

Score: \_\_\_\_ / 5

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

### **Section 6: Supporting Evidence (5 points)**

- Criteria: Quality and relevance of supporting documents (CV, letters of support, etc.).

- 5 = Exceeds expectations
- 3 = Meets expectations
- 1 = Does not meet expectations

Score: \_\_\_\_ / 5

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

### **Section 7: Advancement of Institutional Mission (5 points)**

- Criteria: How the nominee's work supports and advances the mission/values of the institution.

- 5 = Exceeds expectations
- 3 = Meets expectations
- 1 = Does not meet expectations

Score: \_\_\_\_ / 5

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

### **Section 8: Overall Excellence and Distinction (5 points)**

- Criteria: Overall impression of nominee's excellence and distinction in their field or role.

- 5 = Exceeds expectations
- 3 = Meets expectations
- 1 = Does not meet expectations

Score: \_\_\_\_ / 5

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

### **Section 9: Clarity and Quality of Nomination Letter (5 points)**

- Criteria: Clarity, thoroughness, and persuasiveness of the nomination letter.

- 5 = Exceeds expectations
- 3 = Meets expectations
- 1 = Does not meet expectations

Score: \_\_\_\_ / 5

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

**Total Score: \_\_\_\_\_ / 45**