Extension Award Nomination Best Practices

The strongest award nominations weave together a full picture of who the nominee is, the scope of their work and the impacts realized. They use numbers, examples and testimony whenever possible.

The most competitive **projects** are…

- Cross-disciplinary, unbound by the edges of an academic silo
- Collaborative/co-creative.
- Innovative in problem solving and delivery methods
- Responsive to new populations and are culturally sensitive/competent

The most competitive **nominees** are…

- Adaptable
- Effective
- Active across the full cross-section of what is possible for an extension educator – from the field to classroom to the regulatory environment
- Leaders beyond the project's scope
- Those with a history of success

Award Nomination Checklist

The most competitive nominations include

☐ Specific, strong and enumerated examples of **program impact and metrics**

☐ **Evidence of programmatic responsiveness** to associated industry and/or community needs from development through delivery

☐ **Evidence of nominee engagement** with students and with stakeholders

☐ Clear and detailed **program information**, including:
  o breadth
  o delivery methods
  o self-assessments and resulting growth or change, and
  o efficacy as evidenced by industry partnerships/support, strong/repeated resourcing of programs from state agencies or other partners, and/or other awards received

☐ **Evidence of external dollars generated** and nominee grantsmanship — include names and dollar amounts whenever possible

☐ Conventional **academic/scholarship metrics**, including:
  o **recognitions of excellence** at the local, state, regional or national level
  o the number of **associated peer reviewed publications and presentations** at professional meetings
  o information on **resources created**, authored or published, including factsheets, videos and curriculum, etc.

☐ Examples of **innovation** — consider all or any of the following questions:
  o How was innovation used in programs?
  o How was innovation engaged as a methodology?
  o What new effective delivery methods resulted from the work?
  o What are the nominee's ideas for future innovations to build on the project?
  o How did the program innovate in funding and partnership building and to what end?

The least competitive nominations will:

1. **Lack conventional metrics of extension/scholarly productivity** (e.g., peer-reviewed articles, fact sheets, professional meeting presentations)
2. **Emphasize only one program example**
3. **Lack hard evidence** (e.g., names, numbers, dollars) of impact, connection to stakeholders or proof of efficacy
4. **Lack evidence of project** *outcomes* *(e.g.,* A project that created recommendations for growers is nominated. That the nomination details the number of growers who adopted the recommendations, but does not include information on the ***results*** realized as a result of those recommendations were adopted.

ECOP administers an annual Excellence in Extension award process through which extension professionals are recognized at the regional and national level. In support of NEED members submitting increasingly competitive nominations for this and other award opportunities, the NEED 2019 award review committee synthesized nomination feedback into the above best practices.