Awards for Curriculum Development

The University of Calgary’s Eyes High strategy inspires our university community to “enrich the quality and breadth of learning.” Acknowledging that outstanding contributions to this vision can take many different forms, the University of Calgary Teaching Awards recognize excellence in diverse learning contexts, by individuals and teams, and through curriculum design and educational leadership. A University of Calgary Teaching Award is a distinguished honor for members of our university community who, through their commitment and expertise, create deep and lasting learning experiences.

1.0 Eligibility

The University of Calgary Teaching Award for Curriculum Development recognizes the teaching excellence of any combination of academic and/or non-academic colleagues who contribute as a team to the creation or revitalization of a curriculum at the program level. In this context, curriculum revitalization involves engaging in an intentional, evidence-based review process, and identifying and implementing specific strategies for improvement. As this is an award for a collaborative curriculum development process, the award will be given in the name of the program.

The University of Calgary Teaching Award for Curriculum Development may not be awarded to the same team more than once. This award may not be conferred each year, depending on whether qualifying nominations are received.

2.0 Award Criteria

The University of Calgary Teaching Award for Curriculum Development recognizes the contributions of a team of academic and/or non-academic colleagues who contribute to the creation or major revitalization of a curriculum of a degree-credit program. Although there will be specific ways that excellence in curriculum development may be demonstrated, nominations will be assessed based on evidence of the nominees’ demonstrated abilities to use their combined expertise to:

- Work from an evidence-based rationale for program development/revitalization that balances the beliefs and values of the team about teaching and learning, student learning needs, the nature of the discipline(s) and institutional resources.
- Develop a clear statement of program-level learning outcomes and their significance.
- Integrate clearly articulated course-level learning outcomes to guide and motivate learning.
- Intentionally integrate strategies to actively engage students in learning across the program.
- Intentionally integrate formative and summative assessments of learning to support enhancement of student learning throughout the program.
- Appropriately integrate technology to support student learning throughout the program.
• Demonstrate alignment of learning outcomes, teaching and learning strategies, and assessment methods within and across courses and other learning experiences in the curriculum.
• Engage in critical reflection on the effectiveness of the curriculum for the purpose of better understanding and improving student learning.
• Work collaboratively throughout the curriculum development process, valuing the contributions of many different voices.
• Implement specific strategies and actions for continuous program improvement.

3.0 Nomination Package
The nomination should be coordinated between the nominator(s) and the nominee. Nominations may be submitted by up to 3 nominators, who may include any combination of former students, faculty and/or instructor colleagues or academic administrators, and ideally across groups.

The nomination package should include:

• A brief nomination letter (2-page maximum) outlining how the nominee meets the award criteria. Contributed by an individual nominator, or co-written by nominators;
• A nomination dossier (10-page maximum, excluding letters of support); and
• A cover page verifying that the nominee meets all eligibility requirements and that all recommended nomination components have been included in the submission.

3.1 Nomination Letter
A nomination letter outlining how the nominee meets (or exceeds) the award criteria may be contributed by an individual nominator, or be co-written by 2-3 nominators. A well-crafted co-written nomination will in no way disadvantage a nominee. Nomination letters are not included in the dossier page count; the letter should be a maximum of two pages.

“Well-crafted” nomination letters address the award criteria and provide examples to support the claims made. Guidance on writing effective nomination letters is available through the Taylor Institute for Teaching and Learning website.

3.2 Nomination Dossier
Excellence in curriculum development/revitalization is a multidimensional and complex task that requires multiple sources of evidence that can be triangulated to produce a robust assessment. While the quality of evidence is a critical aspect of a strong nomination, so is the alignment across data sources that may include peers, faculty, students and academic administrators. Support for creating a nomination package is available through the Taylor Institute for Teaching and Learning.
The nomination dossier should be a **maximum of 10 pages** (excluding letters of support):

- **Evidence-based rationale for program development/revitalization (1-page)**
  An evidence-based rationale for program development/revitalization that balances the beliefs and values of the team about teaching and learning, student learning needs, the nature of the discipline(s) and institutional resources to set the context for the program development/revitalization project.

- **Statement of learning outcomes**
  The statement should present the program-level learning outcomes and their significance. It should also include a description of how the program team engaged colleagues in articulating course-level learning outcomes to guide and motivate learning (an inventory of learning outcomes for each course is not required).

- **Examples of program design**
  The dossier should include specific examples of how the program is designed to actively engage students in learning. Examples may include the following:

  - Use of formative and summative assessments of learning to support learning
  - Integration of technology to support student learning
  - Intentional alignment with learning outcomes, teaching and learning strategies, and assessment methods within and across courses and other learning experiences in the curriculum

- **Summary of data from student feedback**
  A summary of data collected from students through surveys or focus groups, including evidence of student success in the new/revitalized program. This may include measures provided by the Office of Institutional Analysis and/or letters or comments from former students.

- **Reflective summary statement**
  A brief reflection and summary that provides context for the information presented in the dossier, the overall impact of the team’s contributions to curriculum development and to better understanding and improving student learning, and future areas for growth and improvement.

- **Letters of support**
  Two signed letters of support that complement and align with claims made in the nomination dossier, and provide further evidence of impact.
4.0 Adjudication Process

The selection process for each of the university-level teaching awards will be similar. Administrative processes surrounding communication, nomination and selection processes will be coordinated through the Taylor Institute for Teaching and Learning.

A committee, chaired by the Vice-Provost Teaching and Learning (or delegate) and consisting of one academic staff member, an undergraduate student or a graduate student, and three staff members (a support (AUPE) staff and/or management or professional staff (MaPS) and/or postdoctoral scholar representative), will adjudicate the nomination files.

5.0 Recognition

Recipients will be presented with their awards at a high-profile Celebration of Teaching event. Their successes will be celebrated in a lasting institutional record of teaching excellence on the Wall of Honour in the Taylor Institute for Teaching and Learning.

Award recipients will be invited (but not required) to join the University of Calgary Teaching Academy, from which honorees can volunteer to share their expertise through mentoring, facilitating educational development activities, or implementing initiatives of their own design.
Teaching Awards
Adjudication Rubric

Award for Curriculum Development

Nominee: ____________________________________________

**Ratings for strength and alignment of evidence:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strength and Alignment of Evidence</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rate 4, 3, 2, 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 – Outstanding evidence provided form peers, students, and nominee support criterion. Alignment between multiple sources of evidence is clear for this criterion.

3 – Strong evidence provided from peers, students, and nominee to support criterion, with some gaps evident. Alignment between multiple sources of evidence is somewhat clear for this criterion.

2 – Moderate evidence provided from peers, students, and nominee to support criterion, with gaps evident. Alignment between multiple sources of evidence is unclear for this criterion.

1 – Little to no evidence is provided from peers, students, and nominee to support criterion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Strength and Alignment of Evidence</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work from an evidence-based rationale for program development/revitalization that balances the beliefs and values of the team about teaching and learning, student learning needs, the nature of the discipline(s) and institutional resources.</td>
<td>Rate 4, 3, 2, 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a clear statement of program-level learning outcomes and their significance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate clearly articulated course-level learning outcomes to guide and motivate learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentionally integrate strategies to actively engage students in learning across the program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion</td>
<td>Strength and Alignment of Evidence Rate 4, 3, 2, 1</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentionally integrate formative and summative assessments of learning to support enhancement of student learning throughout the program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriately integrate technology to support student learning throughout the program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate alignment of learning outcomes, teaching and learning strategies, and assessment methods within and across courses and other learning experiences in the curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage in critical reflection on the effectiveness of the curriculum for the purpose of better understanding and improving student learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work collaboratively throughout the curriculum development process, valuing the contributions of many different voices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement specific strategies and actions for continuous program improvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL SCORE:**

| Comments related to overall strengths in the evidence presented in the nomination letter and nominee’s dossier, in relation to the award criteria. |
| Comments related to gaps in the evidence presented in the nomination letter and nominee’s dossier, in relation to the award criteria. |

**Overall rank:**