

	•						
	AHEPPP VALUES	NOT ENOUGH INFORMATION (0 POINTS)	LIMITED (1 POINT)	SUCCESSFUL (2 POINTS)	MEETS EXPECTATIONS (3 POINTS)	EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS (4 POINTS)	OUTSTANDING (5 POINTS)
	Supporting a Collaborative Environment	Not enough information or examples were provided, or the examples did not apply to the nominated person, program, initiative, or research.	Nominator/applicant provided limited information and description of how this person, program, initiative, or research supported a collaborative environment within the past year. Examples provided were vague and immeasurable.	Nominator/applicant provided specific and measurable examples of how this person, program, initiative, or research supported a collaborative environment within the past year; however, the examples provided were not demonstrated on a frequent or consistent basis.	Nominator/applicant provided specific and measurable examples of how this person, program, initiative, or research supported a collaborative environment within the past year that meets the criteria on a frequent basis.	Nominator/applicant provided specific and measurable examples of how this person, program, initiative, or research supported a collaborative environment within the past year that exceeded the criteria on a frequent basis.	Nominator/applicant provided specific and measurable examples of how this person, program, initiative, or research supported a collaborative environment within the past year that exceeded the criteria consistently.
•	Responsible and Ethical Behavior	Not enough information or examples were provided, or the examples did not apply to the nominated person, program, initiative, or research.	Nominator/applicant provided limited information and description of how this person, program, initiative, or research exemplified responsible and ethical behavior within the past year. Examples provided were vague and immeasurable.	Nominator/applicant provided specific and measurable examples of how this person, program, initiative, or research exemplified responsible and ethical behavior within the past year; however, the examples provided were not demonstrated on a frequent or consistent basis.	Nominator/applicant provided specific and measurable examples of how this person, program, initiative, or research exemplified responsible and ethical behavior within the past year that meets the criteria on a frequent basis.	Nominator/applicant provided specific and measurable examples of how this person, program, initiative, or research exemplified responsible and ethical behavior within the past year that exceeded the criteria on a frequent basis.	Nominator/applicant provided specific and measurable examples of how this person, program, initiative, or research exemplified responsible and ethical behavior within the past year that exceeded the criteria consistently.



AHEPPP VALUES	NOT ENOUGH INFORMATION (0 POINTS)	LIMITED (1 POINT)	SUCCESSFUL (2 POINTS)	MEETS EXPECTATIONS (3 POINTS)	EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS (4 POINTS)	OUTSTANDING (5 POINTS)
Leading innovation and ideas for the profession	Not enough information or examples were provided, or the examples did not apply to the nominated person, program, initiative, or research.	Nominator/applicant provided limited information and description of how this person, program, initiative, or research led innovation and ideas for the profession within the past year. Examples provided were vague and immeasurable.	Nominator/applicant provided specific and measurable examples of how this person, program, initiative, or research led innovation and ideas for the profession within the past year; however, the examples provided were not demonstrated on a frequent or consistent basis.	Nominator/applicant provided specific and measurable examples of how this person, program, initiative, or research led innovation and ideas for the profession within the past year that meets the criteria on a frequent basis.	Nominator/applicant provided specific and measurable examples of how this person, program, initiative, or research led innovation and ideas for the profession within the past year that exceeded the criteria on a frequent basis.	Nominator/applicant provided specific and measurable examples of how this person, program, initiative, or research led innovation and ideas for the profession within the past year that exceeded the criteria consistently.
Equity, Belonging, and Inclusion	Not enough information or examples were provided, or the examples did not apply to the nominated person, program, initiative, or research.	Nominator/applicant provided limited information and description of how this person, program, initiative, or research demonstrated and/or promoted equity, belonging, and inclusion in higher education within the past year. Examples provided were vague and immeasurable.	Nominator/applicant provided specific and measurable examples of how this person, program, initiative, or research demonstrated an/or promoted equity, belonging, and inclusion in higher education within the past year; however, the examples provided were not demonstrated on a frequent or consistent basis.	Nominator/applicant provided specific and measurable examples of how this person, program, initiative, or research demonstrated and/or promoted equity, belonging, and inclusion in higher education within the past year that meets the criteria on a frequent basis.	Nominator/applicant provided specific and measurable examples of how this person, program, initiative, or research demonstrated and/or promoted equity, belonging, and inclusion in higher education within the past year that exceeded the criteria on a frequent basis.	Nominator/applicant provided specific and measurable examples of how this person, program, initiative, or research demonstrated and/or promoted equity, belonging, and inclusion in higher education within the past year that exceeded the criteria consistently.



AHEPPP VALUES	NOT ENOUGH INFORMATION (0 POINTS)	LIMITED (1 POINT)	SUCCESSFUL (2 POINTS)	MEETS EXPECTATIONS (3 POINTS)	EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS (4 POINTS)	OUTSTANDING (5 POINTS)
Fiscal Strength and Responsibility	Not enough information or examples were provided, or the examples did not apply to the nominated person, program, initiative, or research.	Nominator/applicant provided limited information and description of how this person, program, initiative, or research demonstrated fiscal strength and responsibility within the past year. Examples provided were vague and immeasurable.	Nominator/applicant provided specific and measurable examples of how this person, program, initiative, or research demonstrated fiscal strength and responsibility within the past year; however, the examples provided were not demonstrated on a frequent or consistent basis.	Nominator/applicant provided specific and measurable examples of how this person, program, initiative, or research demonstrated fiscal strength and responsibility within the past year that meets the criteria on a frequent basis.	Nominator/applicant provided specific and measurable examples of how this person, program, initiative, or research demonstrated fiscal strength and responsibility within the past year that exceeded the criteria on a frequent basis.	Nominator/applicant provided specific and measurable examples of how this person, program, initiative, or research demonstrated fiscal strength and responsibility within the past year that exceeded the criteria consistently.
Continued Professional Development	Not enough information or examples were provided, or the examples did not apply to the nominated person, program, initiative, or research.	Nominator/applicant provided limited information and description of how this person, program, initiative, or research continued advancement of skills, competencies, and best practices within the past year. Examples provided were vague and immeasurable.	Nominator/applicant provided specific and measurable examples of how this person, program, initiative, or research continued advancement of skills, competencies, and best practices within the past year; however, the examples provided were not demonstrated on a frequent or consistent basis.	Nominator/applicant provided specific and measurable examples of how this person, program, initiative, or research continued advancement of skills, competencies, and best practices within the past year that meets the criteria on a frequent basis.	Nominator/applicant provided specific and measurable examples of how this person, program, initiative, or research continued advancement of skills, competencies, and best practices within the past year that exceeded the criteria on a frequent basis.	Nominator/applicant provided specific and measurable examples of how this person, program, initiative, or research continued advancement of skills, competencies, and best practices within the past year that exceeded the criteria consistently.



AHEPPP VALUES	NOT ENOUGH INFORMATION (0 POINTS)	LIMITED (1 POINT)	SUCCESSFUL (2 POINTS)	MEETS EXPECTATIONS (3 POINTS)	EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS (4 POINTS)	OUTSTANDING (5 POINTS)
Research, Assessment, and Best Practices	Not enough information or examples were provided, or the examples did not apply to the nominated person, program, initiative, or research.	Nominator/applicant provided limited information and description of how this person, program, initiative, or research produced original research, literature, assessment, and best practices within the past year. Examples provided were vague and immeasurable.	Nominator/applicant provided specific and measurable examples of how this person, program, initiative, or research produced original research, literature, assessment, and best practices within the past year; however, the examples provided were not demonstrated on a frequent or consistent basis.	Nominator/applicant provided specific and measurable examples of how this person, program, initiative, or research produced original research, literature, assessment, and best practices within the past year that meets the criteria on a frequent basis.	Nominator/applicant provided specific and measurable examples of how this person, program, initiative, or research produced original research, literature, assessment, and best practices within the past year that exceeded the criteria on a frequent basis.	Nominator/applicant provided specific and measurable examples of how this person, program, initiative, or research produced original research, literature, assessment, and best practices within the past year that exceeded the criteria consistently.



# SUPPORTING A COLLABORATIVE ENVIRONMENT

AHEPPP values collaborative environments where members and partners work together to engage different types of families in higher education with the common purpose of supporting student success.

- Values partnerships
- · Inclusive of various types of families
- Shares a common purpose

# RESPONSIBLE AND ETHICAL BEHAVIOR

AHEPPP values responsible and ethical behavior characterized by accountability, honesty, and equity in interpersonal, professional, and academic relationships and in research and scholarly activities.

- Practices integrity
- Accountable for behavior and relationships

# LEADING INNOVATION AND IDEAS FOR THE PROFESSION

AHEPPP values the practical implementation and sharing of ideas that result in new or enhanced programs, initiatives, research, and/or services that support families in higher education, the parent and family profession, and/or the AHEPPP community.

- Develops new ideas and programs
- Enhances programs
- · Shares ideas



### **EQUITY, BELONGING, AND INCLUSION**

AHEPPP is committed to promoting antiracism, equity, belonging, and inclusion throughout the association. As an association, we must work to explore, understand, and create a shared understanding of how to be grounded in equity, inclusion, and anti-racism. AHEPPP values the identities of all association members and families we serve. These identities may include, and not be limited to, race, color, religion, ability, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, socio-economic status, marital status, family status, veteran status, age, national origin, education, and institution type. AHEPPP does not engage in and does not tolerate discrimination in any of its activities or operations.

- Continued personal education and/or education for families, campus partners, and the AHEPPP community around equity, belonging, and inclusion
- Commitment to providing programming and engagement opportunities to all types of families
- Advocacy for underrepresented populations

#### FISCAL STRENGTH AND RESPONSIBILITY

AHEPPP values fiscal strength and responsibility characterized by conscientious and creative spending that makes the best use of financial resources.

- Provides budget-conscious programming
- Thinks creatively about providing programming with little money
- Considers various budgets



#### CONTINUED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

AHEPPP values the continued advancement of skills, competencies, and best practices of its members demonstrated through involvement in AHEPPP and/or other professional organizations, continued education and training, and sharing of resources and information.

- Shares with partners on and off campus
- Contributes to AHEPPP by presenting, being active on social media, or contributing to committees

#### RESEARCH, ASSESSMENT, AND BEST PRACTICES

AHEPPP values the use of original research, literature, assessment, and best practices to advance the knowledge and practice of family engagement in higher education.

- Uses assessment findings in their work
- · Contributes original research
- Contributes literature