



**Thomas J. Grites Service to Region 2 Award
Scoring Rubric**

Thomas J. Grites Service to Region 2 Award:

This award recognizes an individual who has made significant contributions to NACADA's Region 2, the profession of academic advising, leadership in the field of advising, as well as related professional areas, and demonstrates their commitment to the importance of academic advising at a regional level.

Eligibility:

- Both self nominations and nominations by others are encouraged.
- Must be a member of NACADA Region 2.
- Previous winners are not eligible.
- Current Steering Committee members are not eligible.

<p align="center">Award Criteria</p> <p align="center"><i>*All required and optional documentation other than the resume or curriculum vita should not exceed two pages, single spaced, and must be submitted in pdf format.</i></p>	<p align="center">Inadequate</p> <p align="center">0</p> <p align="center"><i>*No evidence is demonstrated. Expectations not met.</i></p>	<p align="center">Fair</p> <p align="center">1</p> <p align="center"><i>*Some evidence is demonstrated. Some expectations met.</i></p>	<p align="center">Proficient</p> <p align="center">2</p> <p align="center"><i>*Most evidence is demonstrated. Meets expectations.</i></p>	<p align="center">Outstanding</p> <p align="center">3</p> <p align="center"><i>*All evidence is demonstrated. Exceeds expectations.</i></p>
<p>Required Documentation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Nomination Letter <p>Optional Documentation: <i>*Strongly encouraged</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Letter(s) of Support <i>*Maximum two</i> 2. Nominee's Resume or Curriculum Vita 3. Nominee's Personal Advising Philosophy Statement 	<p>Incomplete nomination. Required documentation not included.</p> <p><i>Application ineligible for further evaluation.</i></p>	<p>Required documentation included.</p> <p>Optional documentation not included.</p>	<p>Required documentation included.</p> <p>Some optional documentation included.</p>	<p>All required and optional documentation included.</p>
<p>Interpersonal and Human Relations Skills:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does the nominee exhibit a caring, helpful attitude towards students, direct reports, campus colleagues, and Region 2 members? 2. Does the nominee create and support an inclusive and respectful professional environment that considers the needs and perspectives of students, direct reports, campus colleagues, and NACADA Region 2 members through communication, openness, acceptance, and equity? 3. Is there evidence that the nominee is a strong collaborator with academic advisors and administrators at their institution and at other institutions within Region 2 through NACADA or other partnerships? 	<p>Nominee has no evidence supporting demonstrated interpersonal and human relations skills.</p> <p>Commentary does not relate to the nominee's interpersonal and human relations skills.</p>	<p>Nominee has some evidence supporting demonstrated interpersonal and human relations skills.</p> <p>Commentary is broad and includes sweeping statements. No specific examples included.</p>	<p>Nominee has compelling evidence supporting demonstrated interpersonal and human relations skills.</p> <p>Some specific examples are included but lack supportive quantitative and/or qualitative data, such as numeric reports and/or quotes from students, direct reports, campus colleagues, and Region 2 members.</p>	<p>Nominee has overwhelming evidence supporting demonstrated interpersonal and human relations skills.</p> <p>Specific examples are included backed by quantitative and/or qualitative data, such as numeric reports and/or quotes from students, direct reports, campus colleagues, and Region 2 members.</p>

<p>Professional Practices and Advising Advocacy:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does the nominee value honesty, transparency, and accountability to the student, institution, and the advising profession and are they dedicated to excellence in all dimensions of student success? 2. Does the nominee promote and engage in advising and/or advising administration that is grounded in sound theory, research, and educational practice? 3. Does the nominee set high standards of practice for academic advising? 4. Does the nominee initiate and disseminate appropriate advising information? 5. Does the nominee demonstrate effective leadership and advocacy skills? 	<p>Nominee has no evidence supporting demonstrated best professional practices and advising advocacy.</p> <p>Commentary does not relate to the nominee's professional practices or advising advocacy.</p>	<p>Nominee has some evidence supporting demonstrated best professional practices and advising advocacy.</p> <p>Commentary is broad and includes sweeping statements. No specific examples included.</p>	<p>Nominee has strong or compelling evidence supporting demonstrated best professional practices and advising advocacy.</p> <p>Some specific examples are included but are lacking supportive quantitative and/or qualitative data, such as numeric reports and/or quotes from students, direct reports, campus colleagues, and Region 2 members.</p>	<p>Nominee has overwhelming evidence supporting demonstrated best professional practices and advising advocacy.</p> <p>Specific examples are included backed by quantitative and/or qualitative data, such as numeric reports and/or quotes from students, direct reports, campus colleagues, and Region 2 members.</p>
<p>Documented Service to Region 2:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Has the nominee participated in Region 2 professional development opportunities or in leadership positions including but not limited to the advising communities, advisory board, steering committee, division representatives, council, and/or board of directors? 2. Does the nominee actively engage in promoting and advocating for academic advising on their campus and within Region 2? 3. Does the nominee participate in affecting positive change within Region 2? 4. Is there evaluative data that shows the nominee's support of Region 2? 5. Is there testimony by Region 2 members to the nominee's service to Region 2? 	<p>Nominee has no evidence supporting documented service to Region 2.</p> <p>Commentary does not relate to the nominee's institutional advising growth and success.</p>	<p>Nominee has some evidence supporting documented service to Region 2.</p> <p>Commentary is broad and includes sweeping statements. No specific examples included.</p>	<p>Nominee has strong or compelling evidence supporting documented service to Region 2.</p> <p>Some specific examples are included but are lacking supportive quantitative and/or qualitative data, such as numeric reports and/or quotes from students, direct reports, campus colleagues, and Region 2 members.</p>	<p>Nominee has overwhelming evidence supporting documented service to Region 2.</p> <p>Specific examples are included backed by quantitative and/or qualitative data, such as numeric reports and/or quotes from students, direct reports, campus colleagues, and Region 2 members.</p>

**Original rubric design created by Karen B. Hauschild, College of Charleston on behalf of Region 3 Awards and Scholarships, adapted by NACADA Global Awards, modified for NACADA Region 2 Awards and Scholarships by Michele Applegate, University of Delaware 6/28/20.*

References

NACADA: The Global Community for Academic Advising. (2017). NACADA academic advising core competencies model. Retrieved from <https://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Pillars/CoreCompetencies.aspx>

NACADA: The Global Community for Academic Advising. (2017). NACADA core values of academic advising. Retrieved from <https://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Pillars/CoreValues.aspx>