Spring 2025 Application Rubric for University Staff Senator

pplicant Name:	
SAC Reviewer Name:	
eview Date:	

Extended Responses

<u>Application review team</u>: Check the appropriate score for each question based upon rubric criteria. In the "Comments" section, reviewers should document specific examples that reflect the candidate's grasp of the question.

Criteria	Excellent (10-9 points)	Good (8-7 points)	Average (6-4 points)	Below Average (3-0 points)	Awarded Points
Q3: Why are you interested in serving on University Senate?	Thorough, detailed response presenting a compelling reason why they would like to serve. This response stands out among others.	Response is well articulated, meets expectations.	Response lacks details on why they want to serve.	Response is incomplete or missing details.	
Comments:					

Criteria	Excellent (10-9 points)	Good (8-7 points)	Average (6-4 points)	Below Average (3-0 points)	Awarded Points
Q4: How do you see your involvement positively contributing to the staff experience? If applicable, how has your previous staff advocacy experience enhanced this contribution?	Thorough, detailed response presenting compelling examples of how the applicant's involvement would contribute to the staff experience. This response stands	 Response is well articulated, meets expectations. 	Response lacks details on how they would positively contribute to the staff experience.	Response is incomplete or missing.	

	out among others.		
Comments:			
comments.			

Criteria	Excellent (10-9 points)	Good (8-7 points)	Average (6-4 points)	Below Average (3-0 points)	Awarded Points
Q5: What issue (or issues) currently being considered in the University Senate or occurring across the university have the greatest impact on staff? Why is this issue or issues important?	• Thorough, detailed response on specific issue(s) being considered in the Senate or at the university at-large. Clear articulation of why the issue(s) have an impact of staff and why it is important.	Response is well articulated, meets expectations.	• Response lacks details of specific issue(s) and why they impact staff; lacks details of why the issue(s) are important.	Response is incomplete or missing.	
Comments:			•	•	

Criteria	Excellent (5-4 points)	Good (3-2 points)	Average (1 point)	Below Average (0 points)	Awarded Points
Q6: Describe any current or past experiences in staff advocacy, academic policy, leadership and/or volunteer service and how these experiences would be beneficial to the Staff Senator role.	Applicant provides at least one clear example of staff advocacy, academic policy, and/or general leadership/volunteer experience; applicant provides clear connection between experience and the staff senator position.	Response is well articulated, meets expectations.	• Response lacks details on past staff advocacy, academic policy, and/or general leadership & volunteer experiences.	Response is incomplete or missing.	
Comments:					

Total points awarded for applicant:	
(max: 35 points)	

Reviewer Feedback for the Candidate (optional):