

# SPE Honored Service Member

Judging Instructions, Criteria, and Worksheets

## 1. Purpose

This document provides the HSM Election Committee with a consistent method for reviewing eligible candidates. The Committee does not determine objective service-point eligibility. SPE staff completes that review before a nomination is forwarded to the Committee.

## 2. Fundamental Distinction

| Objective Eligibility                                                                                                   | Committee Judgment                                                                                                                   |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| A candidate must satisfy the bylaw requirements and earn at least 60 points under the published service-point schedule. | The Committee determines whether the candidate's qualifying service had sufficient significance and impact to merit HSM recognition. |
| The point total is based on documented activities and predetermined values.                                             | The impact review is judgment-based, guided by common criteria and evidence.                                                         |
| Meeting the threshold permits consideration.                                                                            | Meeting the threshold does not create an entitlement to election.                                                                    |

## 3. Materials Provided to Reviewers

- the completed nomination form;
- the SPE staff eligibility and service-point verification;
- the Chapter Board endorsement;
- any approved supporting materials; and
- the individual reviewer worksheet contained in this document.

## 4. Reviewer Responsibilities

- Review the complete submission independently before committee discussion.
- Evaluate only SPE volunteer service and its impact.
- Base ratings on evidence in the nomination, not personal reputation, professional stature, friendship, or hearsay.
- Distinguish the candidate's personal contribution from the work of a committee, Chapter, or group.
- Identify material information gaps or unsupported claims.
- Disclose any actual or apparent conflict of interest.
- Maintain confidentiality concerning materials, scores, discussions, and votes.
- Participate in committee discussion and vote unless recused.

## 5. Conflict of Interest

A reviewer must disclose any relationship or circumstance that could impair, or reasonably appear to impair, impartial judgment. A reviewer who nominated the candidate, signed the Chapter endorsement, prepared substantial portions of the nomination, is an immediate family member, or has another material conflict must recuse from scoring, discussion, and voting. The Committee Chair resolves uncertain cases.

## 6. Impact Rating Scale

| Rating               | Meaning                                                                                        |
|----------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 — Limited          | Evidence does not demonstrate meaningful impact beyond routine performance of assigned duties. |
| 2 — Meaningful       | Service produced useful results, but impact was limited in scope, duration, or significance.   |
| 3 — Significant      | Service produced substantial and clearly demonstrated benefits for SPE or its members.         |
| 4 — Exceptional      | Service produced unusually broad, important, measurable, or lasting benefits.                  |
| 5 — Transformational | Service materially changed, strengthened, expanded, or advanced SPE in an enduring way.        |

## 7. Impact Criteria

### Criterion 1 — Significance of Accomplishments

How important were the candidate's principal accomplishments?

**Consider:** importance of the need or opportunity addressed; difficulty and complexity of the work; extent to which the service exceeded normal expectations.

| Rating | Standard                                                                          |
|--------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1      | Primarily routine service or performance of assigned responsibilities.            |
| 2      | Useful accomplishments of limited significance.                                   |
| 3      | Substantial accomplishments that meaningfully advanced SPE.                       |
| 4      | Major accomplishments addressing important organizational needs or opportunities. |
| 5      | Extraordinary, organization-defining, or transformational accomplishments.        |

### Criterion 2 — Demonstrated Benefit to SPE

What identifiable results did SPE, its members, or its organizational units receive?

**Consider:** membership growth or retention; financial or operational improvement; program participation or educational reach; Chapter or technical-community strength; student or early-career engagement; visibility, reputation, or member value.

| Rating | Standard                                                      |
|--------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1      | Benefit is unclear, unsupported, or largely asserted.         |
| 2      | Some identifiable benefit, but limited evidence or scope.     |
| 3      | Clear and meaningful benefit.                                 |
| 4      | Substantial, measurable, or strategically important benefit.  |
| 5      | Extraordinary benefit to SPE, its members, or its objectives. |

### Criterion 3 — Candidate’s Personal Contribution

How directly responsible was the candidate for the accomplishments presented?

**Consider:** clarity of the individual role; leadership or initiative provided; evidence that the result depended materially on the candidate.

| Rating | Standard                                                                        |
|--------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1      | The candidate’s personal role is unclear or peripheral.                         |
| 2      | The candidate contributed as part of a larger effort.                           |
| 3      | The candidate played a substantial and clearly documented role.                 |
| 4      | The candidate provided primary leadership or was essential to the result.       |
| 5      | The candidate originated, drove, or personally enabled an extraordinary result. |

### Criterion 4 — Breadth and Reach of Impact

How broadly did the candidate’s service affect SPE?

**Consider:** geographic, technical, organizational, or generational reach; number or range of beneficiaries; depth of impact within a strategically important SPE community.

| Rating | Standard                                                                                 |
|--------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1      | Impact was narrow or isolated.                                                           |
| 2      | Impact benefited a defined activity or small group.                                      |
| 3      | Impact meaningfully benefited a Chapter, Division, program, or substantial constituency. |
| 4      | Impact benefited multiple SPE units, audiences, regions, or generations of members.      |
| 5      | Impact was Society-wide, international, cross-organizational, or similarly extensive.    |

## Criterion 5 — Lasting Value

Did the candidate's service create value that continued beyond the immediate activity or term?

**Consider:** programs or systems still in use; leaders or volunteers developed; continuing financial, educational, membership, or organizational value.

| Rating | Standard                                                               |
|--------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1      | Little evidence of continuing value.                                   |
| 2      | Some short-term continuation or residual benefit.                      |
| 3      | Meaningful benefits continued over time.                               |
| 4      | Durable programs, systems, resources, or leadership capacity resulted. |
| 5      | The service created an enduring legacy of exceptional value to SPE.    |

## 8. Individual Reviewer Worksheet

Candidate: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_

Conflict disclosed? ☐ No ☐ Yes — recusal required ☐ Yes — Chair determined no recusal required

| Criterion                            | Rating (1–5) | Key Evidence / Comments |
|--------------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|
| 1. Significance of accomplishments   |              |                         |
| 2. Demonstrated benefit to SPE       |              |                         |
| 3. Candidate's personal contribution |              |                         |
| 4. Breadth and reach of impact       |              |                         |
| 5. Lasting value                     |              |                         |

Total rating (for discussion only; maximum 25): \_\_\_\_\_

The total rating assists comparison and discussion. It is not a second automatic eligibility threshold and does not replace the required election vote.

## 9. Overall Reviewer Judgment

Does the candidate's record of eligible service demonstrate the long-term, outstanding volunteer service and impact expected of an SPE Honored Service Member?

- ☐ Recommend election
- ☐ Do not recommend election
- ☐ Defer pending additional factual information

Reviewer rationale (suggested maximum: 250 words):

## 10. Committee Discussion

Staff liaison will summarize average ratings and the range of reviewer ratings to identify material differences. Numerical ratings are discussion aids, not election results. The Committee should discuss substantial rating differences, unclear evidence, and any factual questions before voting.

- Reviewers may revise ratings after discussion, provided the revised rating reflects independent judgment.
- The Committee may request limited factual clarification through the staff liaison.
- The Committee should not permit advocacy based on personal relationships or information unavailable to all reviewers.
- Each candidate must be considered on the complete record and against the HSM standard—not against a predetermined annual quota.

## 11. Election Vote

After review and discussion, the Committee votes separately on each candidate. A candidate is elected only upon receiving an affirmative vote from at least two-thirds of the Committee members voting.

- Members who are recused do not participate in the discussion or vote.
- Abstentions are not affirmative votes and are not counted as votes cast, unless the applicable operating policy provides otherwise.
- The Committee Chair records the number eligible to vote, the number voting, and the result.
- The Committee’s recommendations are submitted to the SPE Executive Committee for final organizational approval.

## 12. Committee Vote Record

| Candidate | Eligible Voters | Yes | No | Abstain | Two-Thirds Achieved                                      | Recommendation |
|-----------|-----------------|-----|----|---------|----------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
|           |                 |     |    |         | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |                |
|           |                 |     |    |         | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |                |
|           |                 |     |    |         | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |                |
|           |                 |     |    |         | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |                |

### 13. Chair's Certification

I certify that the Committee reviewed the eligible candidates in accordance with the HSM judging instructions, managed disclosed conflicts of interest, and conducted the election vote required by the SPE Bylaws.

Committee Chair: \_\_\_\_\_

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