



# University of Calgary Teaching Awards

CALL FOR NOMINATIONS

## Award for Sessional Instructors

The University of Calgary's Eyes High vision 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.

### ELIGIBILITY

The University of Calgary Teaching Award for Sessional Instructors recognizes the teaching excellence of individual colleagues on Sessional (formerly "Term-Certain") appointments who have taught a minimum of two courses at the University of Calgary. There will be three awards available annually.

No individual may receive the University of Calgary Teaching Award for Sessional Instructors more than once. The award may not be conferred each year, depending on whether qualifying nominations are received.

### AWARD CRITERIA

Teaching excellence at the University of Calgary is exemplified by characteristics of scholarly teaching that cross teaching and learning contexts. The University of Calgary Teaching Award for Sessional Instructors recognizes outstanding contributions to student learning by individual sessional faculty. Although there will be many ways in which individual teachers demonstrate the qualities of scholarly teaching, nominations will be assessed based on evidence of the nominee's demonstrated ability to:

- Motivate students' interest and learning, and establish relevance of subject matter.
- Set clear goals and expectations for learning in courses and individual learning activities.
- Design learning experiences that actively engage students, and encourage collaboration.
- Challenge learners to develop their critical thinking and independent learning abilities.
- Design student assessment strategies that enhance learning, and are appropriately aligned with intended learning.
- Design strategies to facilitate feedback (e.g. instructor, self, and/or peer) on students' learning to motivate and support progressive learning and growth.
- Exhibit respect for students, which includes showing interest in students' inquiries and ideas.
- Collect feedback, engage in professional learning activities, and reflect on teaching, in order to strengthen their teaching practices and improve student learning.

### THE NOMINATION

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

The nomination package should include:

- One or more nomination letters that outline the case for the nominee, based on the criteria for the award; and
- A dossier (15-20 pages in length). The dossier must not exceed 20 pages in 12-point font, 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.

### **NOMINATION LETTER**

Nomination letters outlining how the nominee meets (or exceeds) the award criteria may be contributed by individual nominators, 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; each letter should be a maximum of 5 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 Educational Development Unit of the Taylor Institute for Teaching and Learning.

### **NOMINATION DOSSIER (15-20 pages. Not to exceed 20 pages, excluding letters of support)**

The dossier should include:

- **Evidence provided by the nominee**
  - A Teaching Philosophy Statement to set the context and provide a rationale for teaching contributions
  - Examples of 2-3 teaching strategies that include why the strategy is used, a rich description, and some indication of impact on learning
  - Evidence of critical reflection that contributes to the development of scholarly teaching practices
- **Evidence based on students’ perspectives**
  - A summary of data from student feedback received across multiple learning contexts and years (e.g., USRI or other course evaluation data). It is recognized that these data may not be available or appropriate, depending upon the learning context (e.g., in small class sizes or in courses with sections taught by multiple instructors).
  - Complete sets of unedited student comments from at least two courses or learning experiences, where they are available, prepared by a third party. In large classes, a representative selection of comments or full sets of comments answering one or two questions may be provided. Please explain briefly how the comments were prepared.
  - A brief reflection and analysis of student feedback and comments to put these data in context and highlight how they connect to your teaching philosophy and practices
  - 1-2 signed letters of support from former students (Note: letters of support are not included in the 20-page limit)

- **Evidence provided by colleagues**

- 1-2 signed letters of support from colleagues that complement and elaborate on claims made in the nomination letter (Note: letters of support are not included in the 20-page limit)

### **EVIDENCE OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS**

Teaching excellence is a multidimensional and complex task that required 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. Support for creating a nomination package is available through the Educational Development Unit of the Taylor Institute for Teaching and Learning.

### **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 Educational Development Unit of the Taylor Institute for Teaching and Learning.

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

The committee will be guided in its adjudication by an assessment rubric based on the criteria for the award.

### **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 Taylor Institute Teaching Academy, from which honorees can volunteer to share their expertise through mentoring, facilitating educational development activities, or implementing initiatives of their own design.



**Award for Sessional Instructors**

Nominee: \_\_\_\_\_

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

4 – Outstanding evidence provided from 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.

Criterion	Strength and Alignment of Evidence <i>Rate 4, 3, 2, 1</i>	Comments
Motivate students' interest and learning, and establish relevance of subject matter.		
Set clear goals and expectations for learning in courses and individual learning activities.		
Design learning experiences that actively engage students, and encourage collaboration.		
Challenge learners to develop their critical thinking and independent learning abilities.		

<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Strength and Alignment of Evidence</b> <i>Rate 4, 3, 2, 1</i>	<b>Comments</b>
Design student assessment strategies that enhance learning, and are appropriately aligned with intended learning.		
Design strategies to facilitate feedback (e.g. instructor, self, and/or peer) on students' learning to motivate and support progressive learning and growth.		
Exhibit respect for students, which includes showing interest in students' inquiries and ideas.		
Collect feedback, engage in professional learning activities, and reflect on teaching, in order to strengthen their teaching practices and improve student learning.		
<b>TOTAL SCORE:</b>		
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.		
<b>Overall rank:</b>		