

NAGDCA Leadership Awards Scoring Process

First round –

- Each committee member will be assigned multiple nominations to score.
- Each nomination is scored by at least two committee members.
- The scores for each nomination are averaged to determine the top scoring nominations in each category.

Second round –

- All committee members will score the top nominations in each category (determined by average scores in first round).
- Scores will be averaged to determine the final winners.
- The **committee may choose to award up to five nominations in each category.**

Scoring Criteria

Score each nomination against the criteria listed below, with 0 representing the lowest score. Please refer to the scoring descriptions when assigning points.

Use of Half Points: Whole numbers should be used whenever possible. If, after reviewing the scoring descriptions, a nomination clearly falls between two point levels for a criterion, reviewers may assign a half-point (e.g., 2.5). Half points should be used sparingly and only when the submission does not reasonably align with a single description.

RATING FACTORS	Maximum Points
Submission meets all nomination requirements (if fail, no other scoring will occur)	Pass/Fail
Quality of Award Entry	
Nomination is clear, concise, and complete	3
Project Scope	
Comprehensiveness of project (e.g., implementation is well-thought-out and strategized, project is relevant, etc.)	3
Imagination/innovation in accomplishing objectives	5
Benefit of Project	
Extent to which the project successfully addresses the needs of plan participants and/or administration staff	4
Degree of success in accomplishing goals (e.g., new enrollments, increased deferrals, fiduciary responsibility, improved processes, etc.)	5
Total:	20

Scoring Descriptions

1. Eligibility Check (Pass/Fail) -

- Before assigning scores, reviewers must first confirm that the submission meets all nomination requirements.
- Submissions that fail to meet eligibility or required elements should be marked Fail and should not be scored further.
- Please notify NAGDCA staff if a submission is marked Fail so staff may follow up with the submitting entity to request corrections, if feasible.

2. Quality of Award Entry (0–3 points) - Clarity, conciseness, and completeness of the nomination.

- 3 – Excellent
 - Submission is well-organized, easy to follow, complete.
 - Uses clear headings, concise writing, logical flow.
 - All required elements included with no confusion.
- 2 – Good
 - Mostly clear and complete but may have minor gaps or sections that require interpretation
- 1 – Fair
 - Hard to follow, overly long or too brief, lacks structure.
 - Some required elements are unclear or only partially addressed.
- 0 – Poor
 - Missing required components, unclear explanation, or fails basic clarity standards.

3. Project Scope (0–3 points) - Comprehensiveness, relevance, and design of the project.

- 3 – Excellent
 - Project is thoroughly conceived and well-executed.
 - Clear strategy, strong planning, detailed timeline.
 - High relevance to participants or plan administration.
- 2 – Good
 - Project is generally solid but may lack depth in strategy or planning details.
- 1 – Fair
 - Limited scope or narrow application; strategy unclear or underdeveloped.
- 0 – Poor
 - Minimal detail or unclear purpose; scope does not justify nomination.

4. Imagination / Innovation (0–5 points) - Creativity and originality in achieving objectives.

- 5 – Exceptional
 - Highly innovative—introduces new methods or significant enhancements not commonly used.
 - Demonstrates creativity in solving a problem.
- 4 – Strong
 - Shows above-average innovation, with unique or creative elements.

- 3 – Good
 - Standard but well-executed approach with some thoughtful improvements.
- 2 – Modest
 - Traditional approach with minimal innovation.
- 1 – Low
 - Very limited creativity; standard practice without enhancements.
- 0 – None
 - No evidence of innovation.

5. Benefit of Project (0–4 points) - How well the project addresses participant or staff needs.

- 4 – Excellent
 - Strong, direct benefits with clear evidence (e.g., improved experience, efficiency, or access).
- 3 – Good
 - Provides meaningful benefit but may not be transformative.
- 2 – Fair
 - Limited benefit or unclear connection to needs.
- 1 – Minimal
 - Benefits weakly demonstrated and not well supported by evidence.
- 0 – None
 - No clear benefit described.

6. Degree of Success in Accomplishing Goals (0–5 points) - Measured results and achievement relative to stated goals.

- 5 – Exceptional
 - Goals clearly tied to outcomes; strong quantitative data.
 - Exceeded objectives or demonstrated substantial improvement.
- 4 – Strong
 - Achieved goals with solid data; impact reasonable and well-supported.
- 3 – Good
 - Achieved most goals; moderate supporting data.
- 2 – Somewhat Successful
 - Achieved some goals; limited or weak evidence.
- 1 – Minimal Success
 - Goals poorly aligned with results or mostly unachieved.
- 0 – Unsuccessful
 - No measurable success demonstrated.