General OTM Grading Rubric –MACURH

	1 Point	2 Points	3 Points	4 Points	5 Points
Nominee (*who it is written for*)	It is unapparent/ unclear what the nominee did to earn this nomination.	Nominee performed the duties and responsibilities of their role, succeeding but not particularly standing out.	Nominee upheld the expected duties and responsibilities of their role well, possibly to some degree of personal accomplishment.	Nominee excelled within their role and held duties to a high standard, making a positive community impact and/or fulfilling personal accomplishments.	Nominee went above and beyond the duties of their role: they took on extra responsibilities, made a community impact, and/or had incredible personal accomplishments. Role AND exceeding acts are defined.
Content (*how it is written*)	OTM is vague, rushed, does not make sense, and/or lacks significance.	OTM has purpose, yet lacks depth; lacks important details and/or obvious effort or time.	OTM is of average read—nominator appreciated the nominee, but did not elaborate on their actions. OTM may be repetitive or unoriginal.	Nominator makes clear notice of nominee's accomplishments and put forth fair time/effort in writing to express gratitude and respect.	Reason for nomination is very detailed; nominator put significant thought into crafting OTM; appreciation of nominee is apparent and high. OTM has good pacing, tells a story, and is purposefully written.
Clarity (*What is in the OTM*)	Is entered into wrong month, refers to actions from other months OR is entered into wrong category, better suits another. No school name listed in OTM.	Does not mention month or any month-specific actions. No school name listed in OTM. Correct category.	Mentions month but does not go into detail about month-specific actions; could debatably belong in another category. School name is in OTM and in correct category.	Mentions month at least once and has some detail about month-specific actions. School name is in OTM and in correct category.	Frequently mentions month and details actions performed that month specifically; could not belong to any other category. School name is in OTM.
Spelling and Grammar (*not including spacing errors*)	**6 or more** mistakes	**4-5** mistakes	**2-3** mistakes	**1** mistake	**0** mistakes

Program OTM Grading Rubric –MACURH (Page 1)

	1 Point	2 Points	3 Points	4 Points	5 Points
Origin (*how the program came to be*)	Program origin is blank, or lacks a lot of details as to why the program was being planned.	Program origin is not clear, and is missing reasons for why the program was originally planned	Program origin is missing 1 of the following. Why the program was needed, how it was planned, and who planned it, including individual and school names.	Program origin is described very well, but may not clearly describe why the program was needed, how it was planned, and who planned it, including individual and school names.	Program origin is clearly described. It discusses why the program was needed, how it was planned, and who planned it, including individual and school names.
Description (*what is the program*)	OTM is vague, rushed, does not make sense, and/or lacks significance.	OTM has purpose, yet lacks depth; lacks important details.	OTM is of average read—nominator appreciated the nominee, but did not elaborate on their actions. OTM may be repetitive or unoriginal.	Nominator makes clear notice of nominee's accomplishments and put forth fair time/effort in writing to express gratitude and respect.	Reason for nomination is very detailed; nominator put significant thought into crafting OTM; appreciation of nominee is very apparent. OTM has good pacing and is purposefully written.
Goals (what is the purpose of the program)	Program has no goals listed.	Program has goals, but they may be vague or may include no further description.	Program has goals listed. Some description is present, but does a poor job explaining why they are part of the program.	Program has goals listed and explains why these goals were listed, but does not describe what the program did to achieve these goals.	Program has goals listed. It is clear why the goals were listed and what the program did to achieve these goals.
Positive/ Lasting Effects (*what residents learned*)	Program has no positive or lasting effects listed.	Program only lists the positive and lasting effects, but may not describe or barely describe why they are listed.	Program has positive and lasting effects listed, and provides a brief description of why they are there.	Program has positive and lasting effects listed , and shows that it helped the community. May not show how the community has improved from this program.	Program has positive and lasting effects listed clearly, and shows that it helped the community. Shows how the community has improved from this program.

	1 Point	2 Points	3 Points	4 Points	5 Points
Evaluation (*How was the program*)	Provides little or no evaluation of the program.	Provides a short evaluation of the program. Does not accurately discuss strengths and areas of improvement of the program.	Evaluation is given, but only briefly explains strengths and areas of improvement. May not go into great detail or provide specifics!	Evaluation includes strengths and areas of improvement of the program, but does not explain how to fix the areas of improvement.	Evaluation includes the strengths and areas of improvement for the program. It includes how to change areas of improvement. Very detailed and specific.
Adaptation (*How can others do this program*)	No adaptation provided.	Provides a short adaptation, but it is vague.	Provides an adaptation, but may need to give more details or be more precise. How do other campus change this program and make it work on their campus?	Provides an adaptation that may include ideas such as, how to change it from a passive to an active program, make it a all hall or intra hall program, what kind of budgets it could work with, or program recommendations. May not be detailed.	Provides a detailed adaptation, including ideas such as how to change it from a passive to an active program, make it a all hall or intra hall program, what kind of budgets it could work with, or program recommendations.
Spelling and Grammar (*not including spacing errors*)	**6 or more** mistakes	**4-5** mistakes	**2-3** mistakes	**1** mistake	**0** mistakes

IMPORTANT TIPS TO LOOK FOR!

Word Length	General OTM is at least 300 words and divided into paragraphs! Program OTM has at least 100 words in all sections, except for the description which has at least 200 words. Please divide into paragraphs if neccesary.
Universal	All acronyms, titles, and campus-specific details are defined!
Debatability	**Is inarguably the best and all points are relevant** ("Ryan is awesome" is debatable; "Ryan goes beyond his expected duties A, B, and C by performing X, Y, and Z" is non-debatable)**!**
Engagement	**OTM actively engages the reader** (why other schools should care about this nominee or program and if they win)**!**
Impact	**Nominee or program made a lasting impact bigger than themselves** (Examples: if a service program made a bigger difference than they spent; if nominee's influence extends beyond a single circumstance; if other schools can be further influenced by reading this OTM)**!**

CHOOSING THE WINNER!

◇   Read each OTM thoroughly and grade it using the categories above.

◇   Rank the OTMs in order of who you believe should win (1 = top pick, 2 = runner-up, etc).

◇   Use your Final Score as a supplementary basis for the ranking, but do not feel limited to rank solely based on the scores!

◇   Submit your vote on the OTM Database and e-mail your Final Score Sheet to the AD-NRHH (ma_adnrhh@nacurh.org) by the 16th at midnight!