



# The Crystals: 2021 Judging Rubric

*A scoring guideline for Nomination Parts I to IV*

## **PART I – GENERAL INFORMATION**

POINTS AVAILABLE: 0 points

Judges will use this section to review the Nominee's current job and responsibilities. For a nomination to be considered, all required fields must be filled out.

## **PART II – CORE VALUES**

POINTS AVAILABLE: 100 points

Each Core Value is judged individually. A minimum of one Core Value essay is required; a maximum of four Core Value essays may be submitted. Each essay is to focus on only one core value.

***NOTE: If more than one Core Value essay is submitted, judges are to score all Core Value essays individually using the 100-point scale. Then adding the scores up and dividing by the number of essays submitted, determine the final overall score for Part II.***

Key elements to look for when scoring each Core Value:

- The nominee's actions concretely and obviously went **above and beyond** his/her job description, such as implemented a program(s) or process(es) that was/were truly **innovative**, *something not done by anyone else in the district who holds the same role as the nominee*. A winning nomination should include **data when available and specific examples** of how an employee has achieved **results** in performing well beyond the scope of his/her job description or in implementing his/her innovative program/process.
- Supporting statements, anecdotes or data that support the Core Value should be easily identifiable.
- Substantial, clear examples/data were provided to support how the nominee demonstrated the Core Value.
- The examples and data provided clearly exemplify how the nominee produced positive results with students and/or colleagues, at his/her site, and/or in moving the district forward.

*Definition of a perfect score:*

### **100 points**

- In achieving the Core Value, there is **no doubt** in your mind that the nominee stepped out of his/her expected role and took on additional job duties or expanded his/her job beyond what can be reasonably expected, such as implemented a program(s) or process(es) that was/were truly innovative, something not done by anyone else in the district who holds the same role as the nominee.

- Nominee not only went above and beyond or was exceptionally innovative, but also achieved concrete, relevant results from his/her actions.
- Nominee exhibited the Core Value without a doubt: a minimum of two to three statements, illustrations or data points can be identified in the write-up that clearly supports successful implementation of the Core Value.
- You could clearly identify the positive, meaningful impact nominee made on his/her students, colleagues, site and/or the district.
- The nominee was truly innovative and/or creative in a unique and exemplary way. In other words, what the nominee has accomplished or created was his/her original work or idea, or a significant improvement upon an existing concept/practice.

*If you feel 100 points is just too high of a score, here are some keywords that might help you to determine where the nomination falls.*

### **90-99 points**

Musts:

- Went above and beyond job duties; implemented something truly innovative.
- You could clearly identify through results and examples the positive, meaningful impact nominee made on his/her students, colleagues, site and/or the district.

Additionally:

- To fall within the 90-99 point range, the Core Value write-up isn't perfect but still very strong with multiple relevant, definitive examples/data that support that the nominee strongly exhibited the Core Value. It is clear that the nominee was innovative and went above and beyond in a unique way that sets him/her apart from peers, enough so to be a Crystal Award-winning employee.

### **80-89 points**

Musts:

- Went above and beyond job duties; showed innovation in his/her work.
- With little effort you could clearly identify the positive, meaningful impact nominee made on his/her students, colleagues, site and/or the district.

Additionally:

- To fall within the 80-89 point range, the Core Value write-up includes supportive examples/data but these simply aren't as powerful and poignant as those examples that fall in the 90-100 point range. Examples/data in this range require you to make assumptions about how they helped the nominee demonstrate the Core Value.
- Nominee was innovative and may have gone above and beyond but not overly so.

### **70-79 points**

Musts:

- Employee may have exceeded his/her job description, but not far exceeded; was innovative, but not significantly so.
- With difficulty you could identify the positive, meaningful impact nominee made on his/her students, colleagues, site and/or the district.

Additionally:

- To fall within the 70-79 point range, the nominee demonstrates the basic qualities important to achieving the Core Value. However, while all the elements are there

(average examples/data, creativity/innovation on the part of the nominee), the nominee is simply not portrayed as outstanding.

### **60-69 points**

Musts:

- Employee may have been innovative and exceeded his/her job description, but not by much.
- With great difficulty you could identify that there was a little evidence that the employee made a positive impact on his/her students, colleagues, site and/or the district.

Additionally:

- To fall within the 60-69 point range, examples/data weren't convincing enough to prove that nominee clearly demonstrated the Core Value and as you read the write-up you felt something was missing. Nominee was marginally innovative and/or only performed marginally above and beyond.

### **50-59 points**

- Nominee did not go above and beyond his/her job duties and was not innovative.
- Examples/data do not substantively support the Core Value.
- Nominee may have demonstrated the Core Value but not in a significant or meaningful way.
- Nominee was not measurably impacting colleagues, students, site or district.

***NOTE: Any score below 50 would be given for a Core Value that was clearly deficient. But because you are averaging your scores for each Core Value, the ranges for 49-0 are defined below just to give a basic guideline for judging those Core Value that are lacking.***

### **40-49 points**

- Nominee was simply doing his/her job, nothing above and beyond.
- Examples/data are very weak and irrelevant.
- It does not appear that the nominee actually demonstrated the Core Value, or nomination lacks examples/evidence to support the demonstration of the Core Value
- No evidence that nominee was making a positive impact.

### **30-39 points**

- Nominee was simply doing his/her job.
- Examples/data were extremely weak and lent no support to the write-up.
- Core Value was very minimally addressed and was not the focus of the paragraph.

### **20-29 points**

- Nominee was simply doing his/her job, nothing above and beyond.
- In nearly every way, the write up was ineffective in trying to communicate how the nominee effectively demonstrated the Core Value.
- Very vague examples/data, if any at all.
- Nominee's work was clearly mimicking the work of others and not his/her own ideas/work.

### **10-19 points**

- Write-up had no relevance to criteria.

- No examples/data provided.
- Core Value was not addressed in any way.
- Nonsensical.

**0-9 points**

- Nominator clearly didn't read the nomination form criteria as key elements were not addressed or even alluded to.
- Not worth scoring.

## **PART III – AIMS**

POINTS AVAILABLE: 100 points

Only one Aim can be addressed per nomination form. Key elements to look for when scoring the Aim:

- Nominee went **above and beyond** his/her job description; was truly **innovative** (*doing something not done by anyone else in the district who holds the same role as the nominee*); and used this innovation to achieve significant results.
- Includes data/specific examples of how an employee has **achieved results** or **acted well beyond the scope of his/her job description**.
- Nominee effectively demonstrated at least one action or indicator, as found in CUSD's **Strategic Plan – Exhibit 0000**, in achieving the selected Aim.
- Substantial, clear examples/data were provided to support how the nominee demonstrated the Aim.
- The examples/data provided clearly exemplify how the nominee produced positive results with students and/or colleagues, at his/her site, and/or in moving the district forward.
- The nominee effectively used the Core Values addressed in Part II to achieve the Aim. (*The nomination form directions read: "Using a maximum of 1,000 words, provide specific examples of how Nominee was able to achieve **one** of the district's Aims over the course of the 2020-21 school year by effectively implementing the Core Values addressed in Part II."*)

*Definition of a perfect score:*

### **100 points**

- Perfect, thorough, complete description of how an employee met the Aim.
- There is **no doubt** the nominee stepped out of his/her expected role and took on additional job duties or expanded his/her job beyond what can be reasonably expected; and/or implemented a program(s) or process(es) that was/were truly innovative, something not done by anyone else in the district who holds the same role as the nominee. Concrete, relevant **results** were included in the write-up that demonstrated nominee's effectiveness.
- Nominator clearly explained how nominee effectively demonstrated at least one action and indicator, as found in CUSD's Strategic Plan – Exhibit 0000, in achieving the selected Aim.
- A minimum of five easily identifiable statements, illustrations or data points were provided and clearly support the successful implementation of the Aim.
- You could clearly identify the positive, meaningful impact nominee made on his/her students, colleagues, site and/or the district.
- The nominee was truly innovative and/or creative in a unique and exemplary way; they implemented his/her own original work or idea, or a significant improvement upon an existing concept/practice.
- There is a clear correlation that the nominee effectively demonstrated the Aim, wholly or at least in part, through successfully executing the Core Values identified in Part II.

*If you feel 100 points is just too high of a score, here are some keywords that might help you to determine where the nomination falls.*

### **90-99 points**

Musts:

- Nominee went above and beyond job duties; implemented something truly innovative. Results were included in the write-up that demonstrated nominee's effectiveness.
- You could clearly identify the positive, meaningful impact nominee made on his/her students, colleagues, site and/or the district.
- Nominator clearly explained how nominee effectively demonstrated at least one action or indicator, as found in CUSD's Strategic Plan – Exhibit 0000, in achieving the selected Aim.

Additionally:

- To fall within the 90-99 point range, the Aim write-up isn't perfect but still very strong with multiple relevant, definitive examples/data that support that the nominee strongly exhibited the Aim and achieved results. Nominee was innovative and/or creative in a unique way, setting him/her apart from peers, enough so to be a Crystal Award-winning employee.
- Nominator drew fairly distinguishable parallels between the Core Values identified in Part II and the achievement of the Aim.

### **80-89 points**

Musts:

- Nominee went above and beyond job duties; implemented something truly innovative. Results were included in the write-up that fairly clearly demonstrated nominee's effectiveness.
- With little effort you could clearly identify the positive, meaningful impact nominee made on his/her students, colleagues, site and/or the district.
- Nominator fairly clearly explained how nominee effectively demonstrated an action or indicator, as found in CUSD's Strategic Plan – Exhibit 0000, in achieving the selected Aim.

Additionally:

- To fall within the 80-89 point range, the Aim write-up includes supportive examples/data as well as results, but these simply aren't as powerful and poignant as those examples that fall in the 90-100 point range. Examples/data in this range require you to make assumptions about how they helped the nominee demonstrate the Aim.
- Nominee was innovative and/or creative but not overly so.
- Nominator does not clearly explain how demonstration of Core Values identified in Part II played a part in the achievement of the Aim.

### **70-79 points**

Musts:

- Employee may have exceeded his/her job description, but not far exceeded; was not significantly innovative. Results included were not strong.
- With difficulty you could still fairly clearly identify the positive, meaningful impact nominee made on his/her students, colleagues, site and/or the district.
- Nominator lightly touched on an action or indicator, as found in CUSD's Strategic Plan – Exhibit 0000, demonstrated by nominee.

Additionally:

- To fall within the 70-79 point range, the nominee demonstrates the basic qualities important to achieving the Aim. However, while all the elements are there (average

examples/data, creativity/innovation on the part of the nominee), the nominee is simply not portrayed as outstanding.

- You are left to draw your own correlations between the demonstration of Core Values addressed in Part II and how they played a part in the nominee's achievement of the Aim.

### **60-69 points**

Musts:

- Employee may have exceeded his/her job description, but not far exceeded and/or was very minimally innovative. Results were very vague.
- With great difficulty you could identify that there was a little evidence that the employee made a positive impact on his/her students, colleagues, site and/or the district.
- Nominator weakly explained how an action or indicator, as found in CUSD's Strategic Plan – Exhibit 0000, was demonstrated by nominee.

Additionally:

- To fall within the 60-69 point range, examples/data as well as results weren't convincing enough to prove that nominee clearly demonstrated the Aim and as you read the write-up you felt something was missing. Nominee was marginally innovative and/or creative.
- No parallels were made between Core Values and the Aim.

### **50-59 points**

- Nominee minimally went above and beyond his/her job duties,; minimally demonstrated innovation.
- Examples/data do not substantively support the Aim.
- Nominee may have demonstrated the Aim but not in a significant or meaningful way.
- Nominee was not measurably impacting colleagues, students, site or district.
- Core Values from Part II were not mentioned in this section.
- Nominator did not mention at all how nominee demonstrated any of the actions or indicators, as found in CUSD's Strategic Plan – Exhibit 0000.

***NOTE: Because Part III involves one score only (as opposed to Part II and Part IV which both involve averaging multiple scores to obtain one final score per Part), the definitions for scoring below 50 points is not included. However, the 0-49 score definitions in Part II can be adapted to score to the Aim if need be. In general, applications in Part III that score under 49 points lack relevant details, examples/data to support claims made in nomination form.***

## **PART IV – LETTERS OF SUPPORT**

POINTS AVAILABLE: 50 points

\*\*\*The criteria states that one of the letters should be from the nominee's direct supervisor, unless that direct supervisor is the individual submitting the nomination form.

***NOTE: Score all three letters individually using the 50-point scale, then adding the three scores up and dividing by 3, determine the final overall score for Part IV.***

Key elements to look for when scoring each letter:

- Letters support the nomination form.
- Letters add additional substance to the nomination form.
- Letters provide anecdotes, examples or information that further emphasize the nominee's worthiness to be a Crystals winner.

### **40-50 points**

- Solidly supports the rest of the application
- Writer offers personal, real-life examples of how nominee has made a significant, meaningful impact on the writer and/or those around him/her.
- Provides insight into nominee's character that builds confidence that nominee is truly exceptional and award-worthy. Letter writer unquestioningly believes nominee should be a Crystal Award winner.
- Through this longer narrative, credible examples are found for claims made in nomination.
- Substantive, high-quality examples/anecdotes provided to elaborate on how employee has exceeded his/her job description.

### **30-39 points**

- Letter offers good, but not outstanding, support to Parts II and III.
- Some examples are given but needs more definitive examples/anecdotes to make the letter stronger.
- Offers only minimal additional insight into nominee's character and achievements.
- Nominee's impact on students, colleagues, site and/or district is not clearly evident.

### **20-29 points**

- Letter doesn't convince you either way that nominee is worthy of a Crystal Award.
- Doesn't add significant support to the rest of the nomination form.
- Appears to fall short of convincing support of the nominee.
- Examples/anecdotes don't provide additional insight into who nominee is and/or what he/she has accomplished.
- Lacking, uninspiring.

### **10-19 points**

- Letter only vaguely supports the application and adds little to no value to the application.
- You have to make assumptions and draw your own conclusions as what the writer is trying to convey is not entirely clear.
- Uncertain as to how much writer believes in nominee.

**0-9 points**

- Letter does not support the application in any way, shape or form.
- Nominee's accomplishments, impact, character are not discussed.
- Offers nothing relevant or insightful.
- May actually hurt the nomination form by indicating that nominee is not who was portrayed in the rest of the application.
- Resembles a generic form-letter that could be about anyone.
- Appears letter writer may have been pressured/coerced into writing the letter but doesn't truly believe nominee is worthy of being a Crystal Award winner.