

Student Leadership Awards Scoring Rubric Score (0 to 5) applied to each criterion, per award	
0	Not addressed. Criterion is not addressed at all, or information suggests the nominee does not meet baseline eligibility for this criterion. No examples, no evidence, or content is irrelevant to the criterion.
1	Vague sentiment only. Mostly praise or opinions with little or no concrete detail. Examples (if any) are generic or not linked to the criterion. Impact is asserted but not explained.
2	Minimal, limited specificity. At least one concrete example is mentioned, but lacks key details (what they did, when/where, scope, role). Limited connection to the criterion; outcomes are unclear. Supporting evidence is thin or not provided.
3	Adequate / meets expectations. Multiple clear examples directly tied to the criterion. Describes actions, role, and context with sufficient detail to assess. Provides outcomes or results (qualitative and/or simple quantitative indicators). Relevant, supporting evidence is provided.
4	Strong. Examples are detailed, varied, and clearly demonstrate sustained performance on the criterion. Outcomes are well articulated and attributable to the nominee. Includes credible supporting evidence with details (e.g. metrics, testimonials, artifacts, links to deliverables, event/program details, role clarity).
5	Outstanding / exemplary. Compelling, high-impact evidence that clearly exceeds typical expectations for this criterion. Demonstrates measurable and/or widely recognized impact, scalability, or lasting change. Shows leadership maturity: initiative, strategy, inclusion, problem-solving, and reflection/learning. Evidence is robust (e.g. multiple sources/artifacts), with clear attribution to the nominee's contributions.