ALFP Cohort 21 Evaluation Rubric - Note that ALFP evaluations are completed using a holistic review. Scores and merit are prioritized. However, the selection committee does holistically review the applicants to account for needs in the Academy as well as diversity (defined broadly and includes disciplines represented, types of institutions, etc.).

Criteria	Below Average	Average	Above Average	Excellent
	(4 or 5 Points)	(6 or 7 Points)	(8 or 9 Points)	(10 Points)
 Demonstrate Leadership Association Involvement (Committees at local, state, national level) 	Minimal leadership experience (quality and quantity)	Average leadership experience (quality and quantity)	Above Average leadership experience (quality and quantity)	Excellent leadership experience (quality and quantity)
 Leadership in Association (Officer) Formal Leadership Position at College of Pharmacy (Vice-Chair, Assist Dean, Associate Dean, Chair, Director) Evidence of other Leadership Development (additional training, certificate on CV, etc.) 	Does not fulfill any criteria	Fulfills 1 of the criteria	Fulfills 2 of the criteria	Fulfills 3 or more of the criteria or 2 of criteria (if multiple leadership positions held at state or national level- e.g. Officer, committee chair)
Academic Experience	Assistant Professor/Less than 5 years of staff experience	Associate Professor/5-10 years of staff experience	Associate Professor/5-10 years of staff experience AND multiple positions held OR Full Professor/More than 10 years of staff experience	Not applicable

Service to Institution	Minimal service to	Average service to	Above average service to	Not applicable
 Member of College of Pharmacy or University or Hospital 	institution (quality and quantity)	institution (quality and quantity)	institution (quality and quantity)	
committee Chair of College of Pharmacy or University or Hospital committee Lead a research team/lab	Only fulfills 1 criterion	Fulfills 2 criteria or if only 1 criteria then multiple committees	Fulfills 2 criteria with multiple examples/committees in at least one area	
Dean's LetterPotential for leadership	Letter does not provide adequate recommendation	Letter provides adequate recommendation	Letter provides above average recommendation	Letter provides above average recommendation
 Why they should be a part of ALFP Mentoring plan with 	OR	OR Weak Mentoring Plan	including some specific evidence or examples	including specific evidence or examples
sufficient details	No Mentoring Plan	(generic and/or only meets 4 or less times	AND	AND
		throughout the year)	Solid Mentoring Plan (provides specific timeline for at least 1 aspect of the plan and meets more than 4 times	Detailed Mentoring Plan (multiple opportunities provided, meets more than 4 times throughout the year, provides
			throughout the year)	specific timelines/details for several of the opportunities)
 Make case of enough leadership experience to go through 	Letter does not provide adequate intent (just re- statement of career highlights)	Letter provides adequate intent (quality and quantity)	Letter provides above average intent (quality and quantity)	Letter provides excellent intent (quality and quantity)
advanced training	Only address 1 criterion	Likely "generic" without many specific examples	Some specific examples provided	Specific examples provided

 Demonstration of need to participate in ALFP Goals for participating in ALFP Leadership/Career aspirations 		Fulfills 2 criteria	Fulfills 3 criteria	Fulfills 4 criteria
BONUS: Compelling			Add 8 Bonus Points to	
Demonstration of Need			the Final Score	
 Compelling argument 				
in letters				
 New leadership 				
position at				
	1			
college/university				