

William R. Simms Awards for Outstanding Youth in Philanthropy, sponsored by CARTER

RUBRIC DESCRIPTION

The rubric is a scoring guide that will be used to evaluate or score each candidate. It has three parts: (1) criteria, (2) rating scale, and (3) indicators. It will enable the judging panel to review, evaluate, and score candidates using the same definitions. The rubric that follows uses a rating scale that provides an opportunity to evaluate candidates on a sliding scale, which will help to facilitate the initial ranking of the candidates as a whole:

- Minimal qualifications: 1 point
- Adequate qualifications: 2-3 points
- Exceptional qualifications: 4-5 points
- <https://awards.afpvote.org/nomination/oyp>

	Minimal Qualifications (1)	Adequate Qualifications (2-3)	Exceptional Qualifications (4-5)	Score
Description in detail of what the nominee did, including goals, process, budget (if relevant) and other people involved in the process (adult leaders or adviser, etc.) and of the time, talent and/or treasure the youth gave for the common good and the results that were achieved. (40 points)	Unclear or limited ability to articulate the processes that went into the project and the individual or group's role in generating results.	Has articulated some of the processes that went into the project and some of the individual or group's role in generating results.	Is able to articulate exactly what went into the project, the motivation for creating it, and the significant results that stem from the individual or group's involvement.	Rating 1-5 from above multiplied by 8, equals:
Description of the impact the nominee had on the community, including numbers of people involved, financial impact, organizations helped, etc. Please include the names and contact information of individuals at the organizations who benefited from the nominee's work. (30 points)	Provides little to no evidence of their impact on the community. Includes little to no numerical data such as people served or dollars raised.	Provides some evidence of their impact on the community. Includes some numerical data such as people served or dollars raised.	Provides specific evidence of extensive impact on the community. Includes detailed and specific numerical data on the people served and dollars raised.	Rating 1-5 from above multiplied by 6, equals:
Long term (3-5 years) impact of the nominee's work. Will the project(s) be ongoing and has the nominee considered next steps or is working on other projects? (20 points)	Provides little or no evidence of project longevity. Does not demonstrate a long-term interest in fundraising, philanthropy, or nonprofits.	Provides some evidence of project longevity and/or continued commitment to philanthropic efforts.	Provides specific evidence of plans for the project's future. Demonstrates a clear commitment to continuing philanthropic, fundraising, nonprofit focused work.	Rating 1-5 from above multiplied by 4, equals:
Evidence that the project(s) can serve as a prototype for others or is easily replicable in other communities. (10 points)	Limited or no indication that the project could be replicated by other communities.	Provides evidence that the project could be replicated but shows limited or no plans or actions towards expanding or replicating the project.	Provides specific evidence of how the project could serve as a model for others and demonstrates clear plans or actions towards expanding or replicating the project.	Rating 1-5 from above multiplied by 2, equals:
Rubric Comments from Evaluator	Total Score (Sum of All "Top" Scores)			
	Total Score (Sum of All "Bottom" Scores)			