



F10 CONFIGURED SUPPORTING DOCUMENT

Selection Criteria Guide

A controlled, editable working derivative for M-T1-CP-11-SD-02.
Complete local facts, approvals and operational evidence before
use.

Release truth. This file is configured for substantive review. It is not approved for public distribution or operational use. Local law, insurance, safeguarding, accessibility, privacy, brand, rights and accountable-owner checks remain mandatory.

Release control

Field	Controlled value
Status	REVIEW — configured derivative; governance, panel, privacy and calculation approval required before use
Supporting-document code	M-T1-CP-11-SD-02
Exact derivative title	Selection Criteria Guide
Source initiative	M-T1-CP-11 - Local Hero Awards
Source initiative code	M-T1-CP-11
Source initiative title	Local Hero Awards
Initiative disposition	Canonical retained
Canonical parent	M-T1-CP-11 - Local Hero Awards
Canonical parent code and title	M-T1-CP-11 - Local Hero Awards
Named overlay or migration label	Canonical body
Redirect or tombstone route	None
Family master	Playbook_F10_Awards_Nomination_Selection_Master.md
Family / master version	F10 / 1.0
Recorded master SHA-256	66e1970b317f45e55a82ddbe72d7c8a42d58fee5f6281a7940d5d17f5143b826
Authoritative index	Playbook_Supporting_Documents_Master_Index.md v1.1
Configured master variant	F10 Section 20 — M-T1-CP-11-SD-02 Selection Criteria Guide overlay
Derivative version	v0.1

Adaptation note

This derivative configures the Local Hero Awards criteria as two coordinated editions: a publishable explanation of eligibility, evidence, weights, anchors, context, tie/no-award and review boundaries; and a restricted panel edition controlling appointment, confidentiality, conflicts, calibration, independent scoring, moderation, recommendation, decision authority, records and recognition permissions. Eligibility remains a pass/fail gateway and is never converted into merit points.

This guide is an operating and governance tool, not legal advice or a right of appeal. The authorised award charter and local governance, privacy, safeguarding, accessibility, records and decision arrangements must be approved before nominations open. Published criteria, anchors and weights cannot be altered mid-cycle except through an authorised fair corrective process.

1. Instructions

1. Complete the controlled award fields and local release gate before publishing or issuing the panel edition.
2. Publish the public edition with the nomination form, eligibility rules and key dates.
3. Finish eligibility screening before any merit scoring.
4. Appoint and brief panel members, collect undertakings and conflict declarations, restrict access, then calibrate with a non-live practice case.
5. Require independent, evidence-based scores to be locked before moderation.
6. Moderate only recorded evidence and anchor use; do not bargain, introduce outside information or default to unexplained averaging.
7. Apply only the tie, no-award, review and decision-authority processes approved before opening.
8. Notify privately and obtain separate recognition permissions before public release.

2. Controlled award fields

Controlled field	Approved local value
Award / cycle / category	_____
Award purpose and outcome	_____
Achievement period	_____
Nominations open / close / time zone	_____
Public eligibility edition / version	_____
Public criteria edition / version	_____
Number of awards	_____
Award may be withheld	Yes / No / Approved conditions
Approved tie process	_____
Decision authority	_____
Decision finality / review grounds	_____
Feedback available	_____
Panel chair / panel members / alternates	_____
Quorum and recusal denominator rule	_____
Restricted scoring-system location	_____
Privacy / safeguarding / accessibility contacts	_____
Records owner / retention and disposal route	_____
Private notification / public recognition dates	_____
Recognition permission route	_____
Version / approval date	_____

3. Local release gate

Gate	Required evidence	Reviewer / date	Outcome
Governance	Charter, eligibility, weights, tie/no-award, review grounds and authority approved	_____	Pass / Hold
Privacy / records	Panel access, notes, verification, decision record, retention and disposal approved	_____	Pass / Hold
Conflicts	Appointment, disclosure, recusal, replacement, quorum and access rules approved	_____	Pass / Hold
Accessibility	Public guide and alternate format tested	_____	Pass / Hold
Safeguarding	Sensitive nominee and child-safe handling approved or N/A	_____	Pass / N/A / Hold
Calculation	Score formula, weights and workbook independently reproduced	_____	Pass / Hold
Communications	Private notification, permission and public-release sequence approved	_____	Pass / Hold

Part A — public edition

4. Award purpose and process

Purpose: _____

The process follows these stages:

1. nominations are received through the approved channel;

2. published eligibility is assessed pass/fail;
3. eligible nominations are assigned controlled identifiers;
4. cleared panel members assess evidence independently;
5. material differences are moderated under the published rules;
6. the panel records a recommendation;
7. the authorised decision-maker approves, returns for procedural correction or does not approve;
8. nominees are notified privately; and
9. public recognition occurs only after fact-checking and permission.

5. Eligibility — pass/fail, not scored

Published eligibility rule	Requirement	Evidence accepted	Clarification allowed	Exception authority
Eligible nominee type	_____	_____	Yes / No	_____
Eligible nominator type	_____	_____	Yes / No	_____
Category fit	_____	_____	Yes / No	_____
Geographic/community connection	_____	_____	Yes / No	_____
Achievement period	_____	_____	Yes / No	_____
Submission deadline	_____	System receipt	Approved outage only	_____
Required declarations / awareness	_____	Completed form	Yes / No	_____
Excluded roles/relationships	_____	Declaration/register	Yes / No	_____
Prior-recipient or standing rule	_____	Approved register/route	Yes / No	_____

Clarification may address only an already published requirement. Comparable nominees receive the same opportunity and response period. Clarification must not invite stronger merit evidence after closing unless the published rules provide the same opportunity to everyone.

6. Evidence standard

Useful evidence is relevant, specific, attributable and proportionate. It can include verified examples, records, data, partner or beneficiary perspectives, outputs and outcomes. The panel distinguishes:

- activity — what was done;
- output — what was produced or delivered; and
- outcome — what changed or benefited.

Evidence volume, prestige, writing polish, job title and project scale are not automatic merit. Collective achievements must be attributed fairly and limitations should be stated.

7. Scoring architecture

Eligible nominations are scored from 0 to 4 on each criterion.

Criterion	Weight	Core question
1. Community value and demonstrated outcomes	35	What changed for the relevant community, and how credibly is that change linked to the nominee?
2. Leadership, service and contribution	25	What distinctive, responsible and sustained contribution did the nominee make?
3. Inclusion, ethics and collaboration	20	How did the nominee work with people, reduce barriers and strengthen trust?
4. Sustainability or ongoing value	20	What capability, benefit or learning is likely to endure or be usefully transferred?
Total	100	

Weighted score = (raw score ÷ 4) × criterion weight.

Example: raw score 3 on a 20-point criterion gives 15 points. Do not add unpublished bonuses. A total supports disciplined comparison but does not replace evidence reasons, conflicts, moderation or authorised decision.

8. Common 0–4 scale

Raw score	General meaning	Evidence threshold
0	Not demonstrated or not responsive	No relevant evidence, or the claim cannot be assessed
1	Limited	Some relevant assertion/example, but weak attribution, specificity or support
2	Sound	Adequate relevant evidence with identifiable contribution
3	Strong	Specific, credible, well-attributed evidence of substantial contribution
4	Exceptional	Compelling, well-supported evidence of outstanding contribution in context, with limitations responsibly addressed

9. Criterion 1 — Community value and demonstrated outcomes, 35

Consider relevance of need, people reached or served, credible change, depth and breadth, nominee attribution and context. Do not equate scale alone with value.

Score	Anchored description
0	No relevant community benefit or assessable outcome is provided.
1	A need or activity is mentioned, but benefit is vague, aspirational or not credibly linked to the nominee.
2	A relevant benefit and at least one specific result are described with a reasonable link to the nominee, though depth, reach or verification is limited.
3	Clear, material outcomes are supported by credible examples or data; contribution is well attributed and context is considered.
4	Exceptional, highly relevant benefit is supported by compelling, proportionate evidence; attribution, context and limitations are addressed, and depth, significance or equitable reach stands out.

10. Criterion 2 — Leadership, service and contribution, 25

Consider initiative, judgement, reliability, effort, courage, stewardship and service. Leadership may be formal or informal.

Score	Anchored description
0	No assessable personal contribution is described.
1	Participation is evident, but the nominee's distinctive role, responsibility or service is unclear.
2	Specific responsibilities or service show a credible contribution and some reliability or initiative.
3	Strong evidence shows sustained, responsible leadership or service, sound judgement and contribution beyond routine expectations.
4	Exceptional evidence shows sustained and consequential leadership/service, exemplary judgement and contribution that enabled others or changed what was possible.

11. Criterion 3 — Inclusion, ethics and collaboration, 20

Consider listening, shared ownership, respect, barrier reduction, responsible conduct, partner recognition and trust. Personal characteristics need not be disclosed to demonstrate inclusion.

Score	Anchored description
0	No relevant evidence is provided, or evidence materially contradicts the criterion and has been handled through the approved process.
1	Collaboration or inclusion is asserted without a specific practice, partner perspective or result.
2	Relevant examples show respectful collaboration or a practical improvement to access, participation or trust.
3	Strong evidence shows shared ownership, responsible conduct and deliberate barrier reduction, with credible benefit to relationships or participation.
4	Exceptional evidence shows ethical, inclusive collaboration throughout, durable trust, meaningful voice for affected people and clear acknowledgement of others.

12. Criterion 4 — Sustainability or ongoing value, 20

Consider capability, continuity, transferability, stewardship, learning, relationships and realistic next ownership. Longevity is not required where a time-limited response was appropriate.

Score	Anchored description
0	No ongoing value, responsible close-out or transferable learning is described.
1	Future value is unsupported, unclear or dependent on the nominee alone.
2	A credible continuation, handover, reusable resource, relationship or learning benefit is identified.
3	Strong evidence shows embedded capability, realistic ownership, continued benefit or useful transfer beyond the immediate activity.
4	Exceptional evidence shows durable and responsible value, strong local ownership or transfer, adaptive learning and a credible benefit path not reliant on continuing personal effort.

13. Context, comparability, tie and no-award

Context explains what was difficult, innovative or proportionate; it does not create unpublished points. The panel asks:

- What resources, authority and opportunity were reasonably available?
- Was the contribution appropriately ambitious for the context?
- Does evidence show reach, depth, quality or durable change?
- Is collective work attributed fairly?
- Would the same evidence receive the same score without names, prestige and writing style?

Approved tie process: _____

No-award rule: _____

The panel may recommend no award only where the approved charter permits it. A tie is resolved only through the process published before opening, never an undisclosed preference.

14. Notification, feedback and review boundaries

Request	Route	Possible outcome
Administrative correction before assessment closes	_____	Correct verified administrative error
Privacy/access/correction request	_____	Handled by authorised privacy route
Safeguarding or safety concern	_____	Restricted specialist route
Process concern or conflict allegation	_____	Governance review of process
Feedback request	_____	Approved level of process/criterion feedback
Disagreement with judgement	_____	No re-score unless published review grounds apply

The public edition must state decision finality and any limited review grounds accurately. It must not promise an appeal that the authorised terms do not create.

Part B — panel-controlled edition

15. Panel appointment and undertaking

Panel role / member	Relevant capability	Independence / diversity contribution	Access approved	Alternate
Chair: _____	_____	_____	[]	_____
Member: _____	_____	_____	[]	_____
Member: _____	_____	_____	[]	_____

Before access, each member confirms:

- ☐ I will apply only published eligibility and criteria.
- ☐ I will keep nomination, panel and decision information confidential.
- ☐ I will use only submitted or authorised evidence and will not conduct outside research.
- ☐ I will disclose actual, potential and perceived conflicts promptly.
- ☐ I will not access, discuss, score or vote on a nomination from which I am recused.
- ☐ I will record evidence reasons, limitations and any score change.
- ☐ I will return or securely dispose of working copies under the approved route.

16. Conflict declaration and decision

Nomination / category	Relationship or interest	Actual / potential / perceived	Member declaration	Decision	Access / recusal / replacement action	Decided by / date
				No conflict / Manage / Recuse		

The affected member does not decide their own management plan. A recusal removes access, discussion, scoring and voting for that nomination and is reflected in quorum and denominator calculations.

17. Calibration

Use one approved practice case that is not a live nomination.

Calibration control	Record
Practice case identifier	
Members present	
Score range — C1 / C2 / C3 / C4	
Interpretation differences greater than one raw point	
Agreed clarification of published anchors	
Bias/comparability risks identified	
Accessibility or system adjustment	
Chair confirmation / date	

Calibration aligns interpretation; it does not force identical judgement or create new criteria.

18. Independent score sheet

Control	Entry
Nomination identifier / category	
Assessor	
Conflict cleared	Yes / No
Score locked at	

Criterion	Weight	Raw 0–4	Weighted score	Specific submitted/authorised evidence	Limitation or uncertainty
Community value and demonstrated outcomes	35				
Leadership, service and contribution	25				
Inclusion, ethics and collaboration	20				

Criterion	Weight	Raw 0–4	Weighted score	Specific submitted/authorised evidence	Limitation or uncertainty
Sustainability or ongoing value	20	_____	_____	_____	_____
Total	100		_____ / 100		

Quality check:

- ☐ Every non-zero score cites specific submitted or authorised evidence.
- ☐ No score relies on personal knowledge, popularity or unauthorised research.
- ☐ Collective achievements are attributed proportionately.
- ☐ The same standard is used across nominations.
- ☐ Limitations and uncertainty are stated.
- ☐ Sensitive or irrelevant details are not copied into notes.
- ☐ A second operator can reproduce every weighted score.

19. Moderation

Moderation is triggered by a raw-score spread greater than one point, materially different evidence interpretation, ranking dependence on one assessor, suspected anchor drift/bias, unresolved verification, a late conflict/quorum change, a tie/near tie or a no-award recommendation.

Nomination	Initial score range	Trigger	Evidence/anchor discussed	Score change and evidence reason	Moderated result
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Protocol:

1. confirm quorum and conflict decisions;
2. display controlled identifiers and locked criterion scores;
3. discuss evidence and anchor use, not personal preference;
4. resolve factual misunderstanding only through authorised records;
5. do not introduce new outside information;
6. allow a score change only with a recorded evidence-based reason;
7. apply the approved tie or no-award rule; and
8. record recommendation, material minority view, conditions and residual risk.

20. Recommendation and decision authority

Recommendation field	Record
Category / eligible nominations assessed	_____
Panel members, quorum and recusals	_____
Calibration / verification completed	_____
Recommended recipient or no-award recommendation	_____
Moderated score and criterion pattern	_____
Evidence-based rationale	_____
Material limitations / minority view	_____
Conditions before notification	_____
Panel chair / date	_____

Authority decision	Record
Outcome	Approve / Return for stated procedural correction / Do not approve
Rule and evidence considered	_____

Authority decision	Record
Correction scope, if any	_____
Final recipient or no-award outcome	_____
Private notification authorised	Yes / No
Public release authorised subject to permissions	Yes / No
Decision-maker, authority and date	_____

The decision authority does not informally re-score. A procedural defect is returned to the affected stage with a clear scope and independent control.

21. Recognition and records controls

- ☐ Recipient and non-recipient notifications are private and use approved wording.
- ☐ Every public name, fact, quote, image, channel and partner share has separate recorded permission.
- ☐ A decline or limited-recognition choice is respected.
- ☐ Panel access and working copies close after the authorised stage.
- ☐ Nomination, eligibility, conflict, score, moderation, decision, permission and review records follow the approved access and retention schedule.
- ☐ A complaint, litigation, privacy or safeguarding hold prevents disposal until authorised release.
- ☐ Public decision explanation excludes unnecessary personal information and confidential panel material.

22. Release and REVIEW approval

- ☐ Eligibility is separate from merit scoring.
- ☐ Published weights total 100 and match the score sheet/workbook.
- ☐ Every criterion has usable anchors 0–4.
- ☐ Public and panel editions share the same approved version, category and dates.
- ☐ Conflicts and calibration finish before live access and scoring.
- ☐ Recusal blocks access, discussion, scoring and voting.
- ☐ Independent scores lock before moderation.
- ☐ Tie, no-award, decision and review rules were approved before opening.
- ☐ Decision records explain outcome without unnecessary personal information.
- ☐ Public recognition is blocked until fact-checking and permission.

Approval role	Name	Decision	Date	Evidence
Program owner	_____	Approve / Hold	_____	_____
Governance / conflicts reviewer	_____	Approve / Hold	_____	_____
Privacy / records reviewer	_____	Approve / Hold	_____	_____
Calculation reviewer	_____	Approve / Hold	_____	_____
Accessibility reviewer	_____	Approve / Hold	_____	_____
Decision authority	_____	Approve / Hold	_____	_____

Until every applicable gate passes, this derivative remains **REVIEW**.