

Rubric for Judging OCULA Lifetime Achievement Award Submissions

Use the criteria below to judge nominations for Lifetime Achievement Awards. Assess the information submitted.

- Each committee member scores alone and then they confer.
- Grant points for each level (Novice, Proficient, Exceptional) for each criterion.
- Nominee must achieve at **least 72%** of the total points to be considered for the award.
If anyone receives 0% in any single category, they should not receive the nomination, even if they score more than **72% overall**.

In the case of a tie in the Lifetime Achievement Award, the Award Committee is to consider the Role Model/Mentor category as the tiebreaker and whomever has the highest points in that category wins – or, the final decision is to be at the discretion of the Award Committee.

****If relevant information is not provided for a criterion of the award, please assign that criteria 0 points***

Section A

Score all four sections.

Award Criteria	Novice	Proficient	Exceptional
1. Service to OLA/OCULA and any other library organization	Candidate has shown limited service (has served on at least one committee, association, etc.) Worth 1 point	Candidate has shown active service (has served on at least a couple of committees, associations, etc. over the course of their career) Worth 2 points	Candidate has shown extensive service on multiple committees, associations, councils (ie. OLA/OCULA), and has served at various levels including a leadership role (i.e. as President, Vice President, Conference Chair). Worth 3 points
Points out of 3: ____ (if no information provided assign 0 points)			
2. Scholarly activities (This can take many forms, e.g. conference presentations, research, publications, editing a book, blogging, etc.)	Has made limited scholarly activities Worth 1 point	Has made some scholarly contributions of scholarly activities over the course of their career Worth 2 points	Has made numerous, significant scholarly contributions over the course of their career Worth 3 points
Points out of 3: ____ (if no information provided assign 0 points)			

Use the criteria below to assess the comprehensiveness and quality of the nomination			
1. Completeness of the nomination	Few, if any, details or examples are provided to support any of the award criteria; lacking letters from a range of colleagues. Worth 1 point	Some details or examples are provided to support some of the award criteria. Worth 2 points	Specific details and examples are provided that clearly support the award criteria. Letters are from a range of colleagues; evidence (e.g. statistics showing the success of a service) have been provided when possible. Worth 3 points
Points out of 3: ____ (if no information provided assign 0 points)			
1. Evidence of leadership	Evidence of leadership is not provided or is not reflected well in the nomination package. Worth 1 point	Some evidence of leadership is provided. The candidate has shown leadership in one or two of the criteria areas. Worth 2 points	Evidence of leadership is plentiful. The candidate shows leadership in several of the criteria areas. Worth 3 points
Points out of 3: ____ (if no information provided assign 0 points)			

TOTAL Points out of 6: ____

Add up the points from Sections A and B:

Section A: ____ + Section B: ____ = Total out of 18: ____