The Harry Hickman Alumni Award for Excellence in Teaching and Educational Leadership

About the Award
Since 1989, the UVic Alumni Association has been pleased to recognize outstanding teaching. The Harry Hickman Alumni Award for Excellence in Teaching and Educational Leadership is the highest honour for teaching excellence at the University of Victoria. This award recognizes faculty members who have demonstrated excellence in teaching and educational leadership.

This award bears the name of Harry Hickman who had a distinguished career as a scholar, teacher, and principal of Victoria College. He was acting president of the University of Victoria, and head of the Modern Languages and French departments.

Recognition
The recipient of the Harry Hickman Alumni Award is selected once per year. The award includes a gift and a $2,000 cash prize. Portraits of award winners may be displayed on campus.

Eligibility
Who can be nominated?
This award is open to all Faculty Members as defined in the Collective Agreement.¹

Nominees must
- have taught for a minimum of three years at UVic;
- be the only nominee from their academic unit (i.e., only one nomination per academic unit will be considered); and,
- have received the major teaching award (i.e., from their UVic Faculty, another UVic level teaching award or an equivalent award from another university or a national teaching award).

These eligibility criteria reflect the fact that this award is the highest award for teaching excellence at the University of Victoria.

Who can nominate?
The nomination is coordinated by the nominator(s) and the nominee. Nominators are to include:
- a UVic student or former student (i.e., the student must not be enrolled in a course with the nominee during the nomination, review/adjudication period); and,
- a faculty member colleague and/or Department or School Chair.

If the Department Chair is not a co-nominator, the Chair must review and sign to endorse the nomination.

For those nominations that are not selected as the recipient, nominations will be held and eligible for review for a period of three years. During the three year period, nominees will be asked if they want their nomination package to stand for the upcoming deadline and will also be asked to update their nomination package as per the current guidelines.

¹ Faculty Member as defined in the Collective Agreement.
Award Administration and Process
The Office of the Vice-President Academic and Provost administers the award on behalf of the Alumni Association.

Selection Committee:
- Chair, Vice-President Academic and Provost (or designate);
- Executive Director, Learning and Teaching Support and Innovation (or designate);
- Two Regular Faculty Members, Artists in Residence, or Librarians (usually including a previous recipient of a University of Victoria Teaching Award);
- University of Victoria Students’ Society Chair (or designate);
- Graduate Students’ Society President (or designate);
- Chair, Grants and Awards Committee, Alumni Association (or designate); the Alumni Association representative will be a member of the Alumni Board (voting member); and,
- Member, Grants and Awards Committee, Alumni Association (or designate); this second Alumni Association representative will be a non-voting member-in-training.

Details of the committee’s discussions and deliberations will be held in camera.

Criteria
Excellence in Teaching and Educational Leadership are the foundational criteria for the Harry Hickman Alumni Award. These two main criteria are equally valued and must be demonstrated within the nominee’s time at the University of Victoria.

Teaching Excellence (50%)
The nominee will demonstrate teaching excellence.

Attributes of teaching excellence may include:
- Student-centred learning: Teaching practices that actively engage students in the learning process and are focused on student learning outcomes;
- Teaching enhancement and creativity in improving student learning as evidenced by reflection, continuous improvement of teaching practice (e.g., new teaching methods within disciplinary context, learning-centred lesson design/redesign, effective assignment development, incorporation of active learning strategies and educational technologies, formative assessment);
- Innovative course design/redesign and engagement in curriculum development;
- Incorporation of the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) research into teaching practices; actively engaged in SoTL research to further develop knowledge of learning and teaching;
- Mentoring of students within and beyond the physical or virtual classroom/lab; and,
- Collaborative approaches to teaching practice (e.g., collegiality, teaching observations, incorporating feedback from peers and students, and/or teaching assistants (TA)).

This list of attributes of teaching excellence is not intended to be exhaustive but to provide some examples of how a nominee may demonstrate teaching excellence.
Educational Leadership (50%)
The nominee will demonstrate excellence in educational leadership within the discipline or field of study, across the University and beyond.

- **Within the University.** Educational leadership across the University may include: actively participating in learning, teaching or curriculum related committees; offering workshops for colleagues on some aspect of teaching improvement or inquiry both in one’s own discipline and beyond; promoting teaching excellence by involvement with relevant organizations/associations; working to promote the fair assessment of teaching and the institutional recognition of student learning;
- **Community-engaged Learning and Teaching.** Educational leadership within the broader community may include: being invited as a plenary speaker or being called on to speak as an expert on television or radio on teaching and learning matters; serving as a consultant on government policy bodies; contributing to public education on key disciplinary matters; writing media reviews or articles for a lay audience on key matters of public interest; impacting public or institutional policy; and,
- **Disciplinary/Fields of Study.** Educational leadership within the discipline may include: public and peer-reviewed sharing of teaching and learning discoveries, for example, through presenting at conferences in the field or in higher education more generally, publishing in academic journals; making significant contributions to curriculum development and reviews; obtaining grants for teaching and learning research and disseminating findings to colleagues.

The list of Educational Leadership activities is not intended to be exhaustive but to provide examples of how educational leadership may be demonstrated. Where possible evidence should be provided in each of these areas. The nominee may also include other examples of educational leadership beyond the three categories.

**Nomination Dossier**

- The dossier must be submitted as an electronic pdf file not exceeding 30 pages. Cover page, Nomination Form, and Table of Contents pages are not counted;
- The dossier will be created using a standard 12-point font and be single spaced with one-inch margins;
- Each page must be legible and numbered;
- All materials to be reviewed must be contained within the 30 page limit. Please do not include URLs or materials besides those requested. The Selection Committee will not review them; and,
- Only dossiers that meet the guidelines above will be forwarded to the Selection Committee.
1.0 Cover Page and Table of Contents with page numbers for each item. This is mandatory. The additional use of section dividers is optional and will not be included in the page count.

2.0 Nomination Form

2.1 Award. Select Harry Hickman Alumni Award for Excellence in Teaching.

2.2 Nominee Contact information. The nominee’s contact information must be included.

2.3 Nominator Contact information. Both the faculty member colleague and the student who are formally nominating this nominee must include their contact information.

2.4 Chair Contact Information. Please provide contact information for the nominee’s department/school chair. Signature of chair is required at the time of submission.

2.5 Nominee’s Education and Other Relevant Experience. List all educational certificates, diplomas, and degrees acquired and for each one the granting institution. List other experiences that potentially contributed to the nominee’s teaching excellence.

2.6 Employment History. Begin with nominee’s current position. Include the date for each appointment and the name of department, school or division.

2.7 Teaching Awards. List the nominee’s teaching awards to date beginning with those awarded at the University of Victoria. If relevant, awards from other institutions can also be listed. Include the date that each award was given.

3.0 Letter from the Nominators (signed and dated)
The letter from the Nominators serves as an introduction of the Nominee to the selection committee. The role of the nominators is to be familiar with the entire dossier and to jointly write the nomination letter. The letter should provide a comprehensive overview and address the evidence in the nomination package specific to the award criteria. This letter highlights the most persuasive evidence and guides the reviewers toward what to look for and where to find it. This letter of endorsement clearly communicates how the University of Victoria benefits from the Nominee’s distinctive contributions. The most compelling letter evokes and reinforces a vivid sense of the Nominee and thus is one of the most important documents in a successful dossier.

Please note: Opinions about a candidate’s excellence are most credible when expressed by others providing clear and specific examples with evidence of outcomes.

4.0 Statement of Teaching Philosophy
The Statement of Teaching Philosophy is prepared by the Nominee and must be current (within the last two years). An effective philosophy statement is personal and genuine. It distinguishes the Nominee’s approaches to learning and teaching. It provides a conceptual framework that explains the values, principles, and goals that underpin the Nominee’s teaching decisions and actions. The Nominee does not provide examples or evidence of his/her philosophy in this statement; the opportunity to do so occurs in the Statement of Effective Teaching Strategies section in the dossier. The statement is usually no more than two pages in length.
5.0 **Statement of Effective Teaching Strategies from the Nominee**

The Nominee also writes this section (updated within the last two years). It is often presented as a narrative and it illustrates how the Nominee’s philosophy is informed by the teaching decisions and actions enacted in the teaching process. The Nominee typically provides the rationale behind the strategies and provides evidence of their effectiveness (e.g., what worked, what did not work). It is advisable to link these teaching strategies to student learning and learning outcomes. This statement is typically three to five pages.

6.0 **Evidence of Teaching Excellence**

*Evidence of Teaching Excellence:* In this section provide evidence of teaching excellence considering closely the criteria for excellence.

6.1 **Courses Taught.** Provide a table showing all courses taught within the past five years. Column headings are to include course number and title, number of units, Term taught, class enrolment, response rate, summary mean for questions regarding instructor’s teaching, summary mean for questions regarding instructor’s course design. Please also include Department and Faculty means. Include a statement of the normal teaching load for faculty in the Nominee’s department. If there were any breaks in teaching then it is acceptable to include teaching activities beyond this 5-year history; for example, a 6-month study leave or personal leave means that teaching history should be included for a 5-year 6-month period. Here is a sample table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number and Title (Units)</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Class Size</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
<th>Instructor Teaching Mean* (Nominee)</th>
<th>Instructor Teaching Mean</th>
<th>Course Design Mean* (Nominee)</th>
<th>Course Design Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 146: The Literature of Our Era (1.5)</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.2 3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These are mean ratings for the ‘global questions’ in the CES. Instructor Teaching is the class mean for CES question 8, “Overall, the instructor was effective in this course”; Course Design is the class mean for CES question 15, “Overall, the course offered an effective learning experience.”

6.2 **Examples of Course Materials.** Here is the ideal opportunity for the Nominee to illustrate the link between teaching philosophy, strategy, and application. The Nominee should choose two to three unique examples (e.g., a novel assignment, a series of lab experiments, exceptional fieldwork, innovative lecturing) that support these links. A copy of a course outline or major assignment is, by itself, insufficient. The Nominee must explain explicitly how each example links philosophy and strategy or how it enhances teaching excellence.

6.3 **Statement illustrating Course Development/Course Design.** The Nominee must provide evidence for excellence in the design of no more than two recently developed or re-designed courses. The Nominee must describe the rationale for and process used to develop and refine the course. If the course was successful because of design innovation, explain what was unique and effective. It is useful for the Nominee to link the new design to the statement of teaching philosophy and/or strategies, to student learning outcomes and to articulate effective assessment methods (e.g., assignments).
6.4 Two Graphic or Tabular Summaries of Data. Two Graphic or Tabular Summaries of Data extrapolated from student evaluations for two distinct courses. Select two courses that are very distinct from each other either in content, teaching context (e.g., hybrid vs in-class teaching) or level of difficulty (e.g., 100- or 200-level vs 300- or 400- level) and provide summary data of student responses to all 15 questions on the CES in a table or graph.

The ratings for all 15 questions on the CES are to be presented in the table below. For each question provide the mean response to that question, the department mean and the faculty mean. Note any significant aberrations that might have influenced the ratings (e.g., low ratings that result from significant uncontrolled changes to a course, change in how ratings were collected). Faculty CES means can be found on the CES reports webpage. Department CES means are available through the department chair/director or through ceshelp@uvic.ca.

| Course Title: |
| Class Size: |
| Response Rate: |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Instructor’s Teaching</th>
<th>Class Mean</th>
<th>Department Mean</th>
<th>Faculty Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The instructor was prepared for course sessions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The instructor’s explanations of concepts were clear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The instructor motivated you to learn in this course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The instructor was available to answer your questions or provide extra assistance as required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The instructor ensured that your assignments and tests were returned within a reasonable time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The instructor was helpful in providing feedback to you to improve your learning in this course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The instructor demonstrated respect for students and their ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Overall, the instructor was effective in this course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II. Course Design</th>
<th>Class Mean</th>
<th>Department Mean</th>
<th>Faculty Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. The course structure, goals and requirements were clear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The materials provided for learning the course content (e.g., handouts, posted material, lab manuals) were clear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The assigned work helped your understanding of the course content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The course provided opportunities for you to become engaged with the course material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The methods of assessment used to evaluate your learning in the course were fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The course provided relevant skills and information (e.g., to other courses, your future career, or other contexts)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Overall, the course offered an effective learning experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note 1: Ideally the two courses selected should be very distinct from each other. However, if an instructor only teaches multiple sections of the same course (e.g., a 100- or 200-level course) then select two sections that are unique, for example, one taught 3x a week vs a 3-hour evening course taught 1x/week.

Note 2: Usually, dossiers should not rely entirely on feedback from classes with fewer than ten students. If small classes are the norm for the Nominee or department, or the classes are graduate student classes, please explain how the data were collected and the significance of these data in the context of the dossier.

6.5 Two Independent peer reviews of teaching within two years of the nomination are required for consideration of the nomination. Peer review of teaching is integral to demonstrating teaching excellence. Peer reviews must be based on observation of teaching (physical and/or virtual2 class) and meet the standards for peer review of teaching. They must be peer reviews of two distinct courses by two separate individuals. At least one of the two peer reviews must come from a faculty colleague within the Nominee’s department. The second review may come from a faculty member or a person in a teaching leadership role inside or outside of the department. The peer reviewer is encouraged to consider using UVic’s Suggested Peer Review Process for Teaching Assessment for this evaluation.

6.6 Two letters of support from former students addressing teaching excellence. Student feedback is integral to assessing teaching excellence. These two letters of support are in addition to the letter of nomination from the student nominator. Remember: please do not ask for letters from current students. Students are vulnerable by definition even when they express a strong, unprompted desire to play an active role in supporting the nomination.

Student letters of support are to be independent from one another. Each letter of support ideally will represent a different course. The best letters are authentic and specific including concrete examples from the student’s own experience. The letter should address the Nominee’s teaching, identifying ways in which the Nominee has been effective in bringing about learning. Elements might include: commentary on student engagement, support for student learning, value of the courses to their overall program, effective teaching strategies (be specific), creativity in course design, teaching inspired by research, student mentoring, and innovative and/or effective assignments.

6.7 Other evidence of teaching excellence. Many instructors demonstrate excellence and commitment to teaching in innovative, radical, or novel ways. This is your opportunity to demonstrate innovative teaching excellence and the impact on student learning. Examples could include (but are not limited to) experiential learning, facilitating opportunities for community engagement, land-based learning . . . the list is endless.

---

2 Virtual classroom refers to teaching online using educational technologies. Observation can be done through reviewing CourseSpaces sites, postings, discussions and commentary, etc.
7.0 Statement of and Evidence for Educational Leadership

The Nominee writes a brief Educational Leadership Statement illustrating how a Nominee’s ideas, knowledge, and passion for teaching and learning have been implemented beyond the classroom. Again, as with the Philosophy Statement, this should be current (within the last two years). The statement should include the Nominee’s personal understanding of “leadership” and why it is defined this way. Effective leadership can be evident on multiple levels: within the university, in the community and beyond. At its most persuasive, educational leadership goes beyond the Nominee’s assigned duties, transcending the confines of the home institution and even the discipline. It makes a difference through deep and significant change.

Remember, the demonstration of educational leadership excellence is equally valued to the demonstration of teaching excellence in this award. When completing each sub-section below the Nominee should provide factual and explicit examples to support the narrative. The Nominee could highlight specific projects, evidence of recognition, assessments of impact, and other supporting documentation. It is NOT appropriate to include a long list of workshops extrapolated from a curriculum vitae; The Nominee should, instead, provide summarized evidence of how these workshops supported the key points presented in the Leadership Statement.

In providing this evidence, keep in mind the significance of the Nominee’s role. Serving on committees and attending teaching workshops provide only modest support for a case. But creating disciplinary, campus or national initiatives, or inspiring changes internationally is more persuasive. Explain why something is important and how it makes a difference, and what the Nominee did to make that difference. To strengthen the nomination, evidence may be provided in the following areas:

7.1 Within the University of Victoria. Educational leadership may include sitting on university committees but exceptional leadership goes beyond this. The Nominee may have introduced major program initiatives or student awards or been an exceptional mentor to new faculty. Give specifics.

7.2 Community Engaged Learning and Teaching. Perhaps the Nominee engaged the community in unique ways, such as, initiating community forums, being involved in media on social or public issues, or may have facilitated connections with community agencies or other educational institutions on topical issues or in an advocacy role.

7.3 Disciplinary/Field of Study. Exceptional leaders create and offer development to colleagues through their disciplines or professional organizations to foster and share fresh ideas and knowledge. They inspire others through their writing and through their advocacy because they are deeply invested in teaching. They create and support change in the way that teaching is undertaken, understood, and respected.

7.4 Other evidence of educational leadership. Many instructors demonstrate excellence in educational leadership through novel ways. This section provides an opportunity to include examples or evidence of innovative educational leadership.
8.0 Summary Statement from Nominee
In the nominee’s own words: What does excellence in teaching and educational leadership mean to you and why do you see yourself as a strong candidate for the Harry Hickman Alumni Award? (recommended length, 150 words).