

# **GUAVA Innovation Awards**

## Selection Committee Rubric & Guidelines

Academic Year 2025–2026

---

**Group of Universities for the Advancement of Vietnamese in America**

---

*For internal use by the Selection Committee only*  
[www.guavamerica.org](http://www.guavamerica.org)

Award Showcase: May 16, 2026  
Winner Announcement: April 25, 2026

## Part 1: Overview

The GUAVA Innovation Awards, launched by the GUAVA Board in 2024–2025, recognize outstanding and transformative contributions to Vietnamese language education. Each spring, GUAVA members are invited to submit innovative projects implemented within the past two academic years. This document provides the evaluation rubric and procedural guidelines for the Selection Committee.

## Award Categories

---

### **Instructional Innovation:**

Creative teaching strategies, methods, or learning activities that enhance student engagement and learning outcomes, including interdisciplinary or unique approaches.

### **Educational Technology:**

Development and implementation of innovative educational technology tools, apps, or platforms that improve teaching and learning in Vietnamese language classrooms.

### **Community Engagement:**

Initiatives that strengthen ties between schools, families, and communities, showcasing cross-cultural understanding, involvement, or resource sharing.

### **Professional Development:**

Innovative approaches to educator professional growth, including peer learning communities or resources that support ongoing teacher development.

## Timeline — AY 2025–2026

---

<b>Application Opens</b>	February 15, 2026
<b>Application Deadline</b>	March 15, 2026 (Extended March 30, 2026)
<b>Committee Review Period</b>	March 16 – April 20, 2026
<b>Winner Announcement</b>	April 25, 2026
<b>Awards Showcase / Presentation</b>	May 16, 2026

## Part 2: Selection Committee Guidelines

### 2.1 Committee Composition

---

The Selection Committee consists of 3 to 5 members, including one designated Chair. Members should be experts in Vietnamese language education, instructional design, or a related field, and must be individuals of integrity with no conflicts of interest with any applicant.

#### Committee Chair

The Chair is responsible for the overall management of the review process. Specific responsibilities include:

- Distribute submission materials to all reviewers promptly after the application deadline.
- Communicate review deadlines, instructions, and this rubric to all committee members.
- Collect and compile completed scoresheets from all reviewers.
- Calculate average scores across reviewers for each submission.
- Facilitate a committee discussion meeting to resolve ties or borderline cases.
- Make the final award determination in consultation with the committee.
- Prepare a summary report of results for the GUAVA Board.
- Communicate award decisions to applicants and the GUAVA Board by the announced date.

#### Committee Members

Each committee member is responsible for:

- Reviewing all assigned submissions independently and impartially.
- Completing a scoresheet for each submission using this rubric.
- Submitting completed scoresheets to the Chair by the agreed internal deadline.
- Participating in the committee discussion meeting if called by the Chair.
- Maintaining strict confidentiality of submissions and deliberations.

### 2.2 Conflict of Interest Policy

---

Prior to beginning review, each committee member must declare any potential conflict of interest. A conflict of interest exists if a reviewer:

- Is the applicant, a co-author, or a close collaborator on a submitted project.
- Has a personal or professional relationship that could bias their evaluation.
- Is employed at the same institution as an applicant for a submission they are reviewing.

If a conflict of interest is identified, the member must recuse themselves from evaluating that specific submission and notify the Chair. The Chair will reassign the submission or, if necessary, evaluate it themselves.

## 2.3 Review Process

---

The committee follows a structured two-stage process:

### Stage 1: Independent Review

Each reviewer independently reads all submitted materials (application form, 500-word executive summary, and supporting materials).

Reviewers score each submission on all three criteria using the scoring rubric (see Part 3).

Reviewers record written notes justifying each score on their individual scoresheet.

Completed scoresheets are submitted to the Chair by the internal deadline.

### Stage 2: Committee Deliberation

The Chair compiles all scores and calculates average scores per submission.

The committee meets (virtually or in person) to discuss results, especially for:

- a) *Submissions where reviewer scores differ by 2 or more points on any criterion.*
- b) *Submissions that fall on the boundary between award tiers (e.g., score of 9 vs. 10).*
- c) *Cases where multiple strong submissions compete in the same category.*

The committee reaches consensus through discussion. The Chair holds a deciding vote in the event of an unresolved tie.

Final award decisions are recorded and communicated to applicants.

## 2.4 Confidentiality

---

All submitted materials, reviewer scores, and deliberations are strictly confidential.

Committee members must not:

- Share submission contents or review outcomes with anyone outside the committee before the official announcement.
- Discuss individual submission scores with applicants.
- Use submission materials for any purpose other than the evaluation process.

Breach of confidentiality may result in removal from the committee and disqualification of affected submissions.

## 2.5 Eligibility Verification

---

Before scoring, the Chair verifies that each submission meets all eligibility requirements:

- Applicant is a current GUAVA member at the time of submission.
- Innovation was implemented in courses offered between Spring 2025 and Spring 2026.
- Only one submission per applicant (individual or group).
- Submission includes: completed application form, 500-word executive summary, and supporting materials.

Submissions that do not meet eligibility requirements are disqualified prior to review and the applicant is notified by the Chair.

## Part 3: Evaluation Rubric

### 3.1 Scoring Criteria

Each submission is evaluated holistically on three equally-weighted criteria. Reviewers assign a score of 1 to 5 for each criterion, for a maximum total of 15 points.

Criterion	Description	Weight	Score (1–5)
<b>Level of Innovation</b>	Degree to which the submission presents novel, creative, and pioneering ideas, tools, or practices in Vietnamese language education.	33%	___ / 5
<b>Impact on Student Learning</b>	Demonstrated or potential impact of the innovation on improving academic performance, skill development, and overall student growth.	33%	___ / 5
<b>Potential for Broader Application</b>	Potential for the innovation to be scaled and implemented effectively across other Vietnamese language classrooms.	34%	___ / 5
<b>TOTAL SCORE (max 15)</b>		<b>100%</b>	<b>___ / 15</b>

### 3.2 Score Descriptors

Use the following descriptors as a guide when assigning scores. Scores should reflect the overall quality of the submission relative to the criterion, not just the written proposal.

Score	Rating	Descriptor
<b>5</b>	<b>Exceptional</b>	Outstanding in all respects. The submission represents a transformative, pioneering contribution to Vietnamese language education with clear evidence of significant impact.
<b>4</b>	<b>Strong</b>	Clearly exceeds expectations. Well-articulated, evidence-based, and impactful. Minor areas for improvement but overall an excellent submission.
<b>3</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	Meets expectations. Demonstrates competence and clear effort. Some aspects could be better developed or supported with stronger evidence.
<b>2</b>	<b>Developing</b>	Shows some merit but lacks sufficient depth, evidence, or clear articulation. Significant revisions would be needed.
<b>1</b>	<b>Insufficient</b>	Does not meet the minimum expectations. Limited originality, impact, or evidence. Does not qualify for an award.

### 3.3 Award Thresholds

The following thresholds provide guidance for award recommendations. The committee may adjust these thresholds at their discretion based on the overall quality and distribution of the submission pool in a given year.

Score	Award	Prize	Notes
13–15	1st Place Award	\$250	Highest-ranked submission per category demonstrating exceptional merit across all criteria.
11–12	2nd Place Award	\$200	Strong submission with clear merit and significant impact on Vietnamese language education.
9–10	3rd Place Award	\$150	Noteworthy work with solid foundations and demonstrated commitment to the field.
7–8	Honorable Mention	—	Commendable effort. May be featured at GUAVA Member Highlight events.
< 7	Not Recommended	—	Submission does not meet the threshold for recognition.

*Note:* These thresholds are recommended guidelines. Final award decisions are made by committee consensus. If no submission achieves the threshold for a given placement, the committee may choose not to award that placement rather than lower the standard.

## Part 4: Individual Reviewer Scoresheet

Reviewers should complete one copy of this scoresheet for each submission. Scoresheets are submitted to the Committee Chair upon completion.

### Submission Information

<b>Project Title</b>	
<b>Applicant Name</b>	
<b>Institution</b>	
<b>Category</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Instructional Innovation <input type="checkbox"/> Educational Technology <input type="checkbox"/> Community Engagement <input type="checkbox"/> Professional Development
<b>Reviewer Name</b>	
<b>Date</b>	

### Scores & Notes

Criterion	Reviewer notes	Score (1–5)
Level of Innovation		___ / 5
Impact on Student Learning		___ / 5
Potential for Broader Application		___ / 5
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>___ / 15</b>

### Overall Recommendation

<b>Award recommendation</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1st Place <input type="checkbox"/> 2nd Place <input type="checkbox"/> 3rd Place <input type="checkbox"/> Honorable Mention <input type="checkbox"/> Not recommended
<b>Strengths</b>	
<b>Areas for improvement</b>	

Reviewer Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## Part 5: Chair Summary & Tally Sheet

The Committee Chair completes this sheet after collecting all individual scoresheets. Average scores are calculated across all reviewers to produce a final ranking.

### Scoring Summary

Instructions: Enter each reviewer's total score (out of 15) for each submission. Calculate the average. Use averages and award thresholds from Part 3 to finalize recommendations.

Submission / Applicant	Institution	Category	R1	R2	R3	Avg	Recommendation

*R1, R2, R3 = Reviewer 1, 2, 3 total scores. Average = sum of reviewer scores / number of reviewers. For committees with 4 or 5 members, add additional reviewer columns as needed.*

### Final Award Decisions

Award	Project Title	Recipient	Institution
1st Place (\$250)			
2nd Place (\$200)			
3rd Place (\$150)			
Honorable Mention			
Honorable Mention			

Chair Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Final Decision: \_\_\_\_\_