

Aga Khan University

Entity-based Awards for Excellence in Teaching (EAET)

1.0 Introduction to Teaching Awards

1.1. Why Teaching Awards?

High quality, inspiring, and impactful teaching is at the heart of higher education. Among various initiatives to promote quality teaching, *Teaching Awards* are considered as a promising opportunity to promote teaching excellence through publicly recognizing, celebrating, supporting, and rewarding a cadre of exceptional teaching practices that has significant impact on student learning experiences (UCSF-Excellence in Teaching Awards- 2015 & 2017; Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education (STLHE); HEA-UK National Teaching Fellowship Scheme, 2000). Studies from around the world have shown that *Teaching Awards* have strong and positive personal and institution-wide impact on motivating academic staff for high-quality teaching, encouraging innovation in their teaching activities, raising the profile of teaching; and improving institutional recognition and awareness about teaching and learning (Shephard, Stein, Tidswell & Harland, 2010, Layton & Brown, 2011, Schindler et al., 2013).

1.2. Teaching Awards at the Aga Khan University

In line with these evidence-based practices and international benchmarks, the Aga Khan University (AKU) has also led on initiatives to seek progression in teaching excellence at a strategic level through the TEACH fellowships, Teachers' Academy, and Teaching Awards.

Pakistan based entities at the AKU (School of Nursing and Midwifery- SONAM, Medical College-MC & Institute for Educational Development-IED) present awards during convocation for excellence in teaching with an aim to recognize the outstanding academic work of individual faculty and to reward their sustained, substantial and consistent contribution in teaching. Table 1 presents current Entity-based Awards at AKU, Pakistan. No such awards are currently presented in East Africa.

Currently, AKU is in the process of reconsidering its University-wide and entity-based awards for teaching excellence which include *Award for Impactful Teaching and Teaching Leadership (AITTL)*, *Emerging Collaborative Practices in Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (ECPSOTL)*, and *Entity-based Award for Excellence in Teaching (AET)*. This paper focuses on the latter (AET)

1.3. The purpose of this document

Recent Academic Days on teaching and learning (Sept 2017/2018) have identified Teaching Awards as an important vehicle to recognize and reward good teaching. TL_net was asked to support Academic Entities to develop a scheme of recognition through awards that are benchmarked to institutional goals and international best practice. **This paper identifies good practice guidelines for Entities to consider and choose from seven potential awards they may wish to award faculty to recognize the importance of good teaching practice.**

Table 1. Existing Entity-based Awards at the Aga Khan University

	<u>IED: Faculty Merit Awards of Scholarship and Best Teacher</u>	<u>MC: Outstanding teacher awards</u>	<u>SONAM: Outstanding teacher awards</u>	<u>Aga Khan University Award: Award for Excellence in Education</u>
Purpose	To recognize the outstanding academic work of individual faculty 2 Awards Scholarship of: Discovery Integration Application Teaching BEST TEACHER	To recognise minimum of three years sustained, substantial and consistent contribution to teaching Excellence in teaching as judged: By Peers By Students Across departments	To recognize distinguished teachers Award for Outstanding Teacher of: The Year Classroom Teaching Clinical Teaching	To recognize faculty who have made outstanding contributions to education; to promote and acknowledge excellence in teaching. Educational activity may include curriculum and course design, evaluation of programmes and students, development of learning resources, and teaching
Eligibility Criteria	Individual faculty	Full time MC faculty	Full time (2 yrs) and Part-time (4 years) faculty	Active or retired full and PT faculty
Nomination Process	1. Faculty development committee reviews with internal and external members and makes recommendations to the Director. 2. Best Teacher: Nominated by Students facilitated by Registrar's Office	Peer and students nominate with nomination form to an ad-hoc committee and recommended to Dean	Self or nominated to adhoc committee <i>The faculty has not received any of the AKUSON Outstanding Teaching Awards within the past 2 years!</i>	University Awards Committee: Chair: President Membership shall be comprised of: The Provost; Dean, Research Two Deans from PK (MC; AKUSONAM; IED) or ISMC; Two Deans EA (MC; ANS; IED), Two members appointed by the President, normally long-serving or retired members of the Board, faculty or staff. Secretary: Registrar
Assessment Criteria	Faculty self or other nominations. CV; Teaching: student evaluations of teaching; a testimonial from a teaching colleague, a module/course proposal, a module/course outline or evidence of innovation in teaching.	Peer or self-nominations 2 Nominations using a form from nominator and seconder; CV; Teaching evaluations for the past 3 years.	Nomination form and last year of student evaluation of teaching.	Nominations from Deans to Registrar. Shortlisted by 4 member working group. Each nomination consists of two letters from faculty, staff or Trustees detailing the reasons for the nomination, along with the curriculum vitae of the nominee and sufficient supportive information to enable evaluation.

2.0. Issues related to the Current Entity-based Awards at AKU

A thorough examination of current entity based awards revealed that there are major differences in these awards which are presented below:

2.1. Conception of Excellence in Teaching

The Teaching and Learning framework (Policy 031) develops a shared understanding of teaching excellence at AKU. However, current teaching awards do not reflect these shared principles of teaching. This presents two issues: a) *there is a lack of consistency among entities on the basic idea of excellence in teaching which is not aligned to the TL framework;* and b) *due to varying conceptions of excellence in teaching, the awards schemes differ from one another and each award requires a different kind of evidence to be able to make a case for excellence.*

2.2. Process of Nomination

The current awards do not present a clear and explicit nomination criteria. Also, the nomination process for most of the awards is not inclusive of nominations from students, alumni, staff, or self and is largely limited to peer and leadership. This presents two issues: a) *it does not represent the voices of students, alumni, or staff who may be directly involved in the teaching and learning process;* and b) *limiting the nomination to peers and leadership may increase the probability of partiality during the application process.*

2.3. Eligibility Criteria

The current awards do not present a clear and explicit eligibility criteria. The eligibility criteria in most of the current awards is inconsistent with respect to the nature of faculty member's academic service (full-time or part-time), their professional commitment, and/or their experience (years of service).

2.4. Assessment Criteria

Most of the current awards schemes do not represent evidence-based assessment criteria, and therefore, is prone to subjectivity and may not have inter-rater reliability. Although, some of the awards include an explicit assessment criteria (including statements of purpose or reflection, recommendation letters, forms of evidence to elicit a full and well-rounded application or teaching portfolio); others, however, only include a form of application along with letter of nominations for assessment with little evidence verifying teaching excellence. Moreover, the Teaching and Learning Framework (Policy 031) shares the principles of good teaching which most existing awards do not reflect in benchmarking their evaluation of excellence teaching.

2.5. Kind of Reward

The current awards do not clearly define the kind of reward that will be presented to the faculty members, though for some awards, the faculty receives a cash-award. Good practice advocate for providing a cash-award but requiring faculty to invest that for improving the quality of teaching and learning at the institution (Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education (STLHE); HEA-UK National Teaching Fellowship Scheme, 2000).

3.0. Guidelines for Designing Entity-based Teaching Awards

Considering the issues with the current entity based awards and guidance from university leadership to reconsider these awards, TL_net has prepared some generic guidelines on designing and implementing Entity-based Awards for Excellence in Teaching. These guidelines are aligned with University's Teaching and Learning Framework and are driven from best practices in literature around teaching awards and examples from our partner universities. The guidelines are followed by examples of different kinds of teaching awards (Table 2).

3.1. Conceptions of Excellence in Teaching Underlying Teaching Award Schemes

The conceptions of teaching excellence underpins the teaching award schemes and the implications of these conceptions informs the types of evidence required to be submitted for assessment. The HEA-UK National Teaching Fellowship Scheme (NTFS) provided the benchmark to represent excellence in teaching in Universities based on the UK, Professional Standards Framework (UKPSF). Inspired from HEA's scheme for rewarding excellence in teaching, we have identified some broadly consensual themes which are closely aligned to AKU's TL framework, TEACH fellowship scheme and also reflects AKU's core values on quality and relevance in teaching. The themes include:

- a) **Individual excellence:** This theme requires faculty to provide evidence for measurable, significant and long-lasting improvements in student learning, achieved through identifying students' needs and applying exceptional, effective and evidence-based teaching practices.
- b) **Raising the profile of excellence:** This theme requires faculty to demonstrate their contribution towards leading a culture of collaboration and connectedness within and/or beyond the classroom. Faculty may include evidences of how they have shared knowledge to create a professional learning culture that develops the skills of peers and increases collective impact
- c) **Developing excellence through Scholarship of Teaching and Learning:** This theme requires faculty members to demonstrate their contribution towards systematic inquiry, leading to an in-depth understanding of a particular teaching interventions rather than a surface evaluation of the success of the intervention. Evidence may include: paper presentations, and publications.

3.2. Eligibility Criteria

Recent literature on awards for teaching excellence advocates for a clear eligibility criteria which provides provision to faculty members, both full-time and part-time, who are currently engaged in teaching practices, to apply for the award. This is because, once faculty receives the award, s/he continues to make contributions to the institution (Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education (STLHE) and HEA-UK National Teaching Fellowship Scheme, 2018).

3.3. Nomination Process

For the nomination process, the current literature advocates for a shift from '*only institute giving an award to the faculty for their performance in the past*' to '*enabling different stakeholders who have been engaged directly in the teaching and learning process to take part in the nomination and faculty striving to acquire an award (self-nomination)*' (Skelton, 2004).

3.4. Assessment Criteria

Best practices around teaching awards advocate for explicit and evidenced-based assessment criteria. A proper evaluation criteria must be developed to assess the applications and applicant should be encouraged to share proper evidences to support their claims related to their teaching practices (Skelton, 2004; STLHE, n.d.)

- a) **Form of Evidence:** Literature suggests that one of the most recommended ways to assess teaching excellence is through '*Teaching Portfolio*' as suggested by Seldin, Miller and Seldin (2010). The portfolio comprises two parts:

- **Claim for Award:** A reflective narrative about the teaching and learning of the applicant and describing their own experience and knowledge of teaching and learning with reference of their teaching philosophy.
- **Evidence for Award:** All claims made in the narrative need to be substantiated with evidence. This can be in the form of examples from self, peers, students and institutional leadership to substantiate the claim made within the reflective narrative (Gibbs & Habeshaw, 2002; Seldin, 2003).

b) Triangulation in Evidence Since teaching is considered as a communal rather than a solitary activity, therefore, evidence related to the teaching practices should be 'triangulated' from different sources who have been directly involved in the process. This process helps in strengthening the overall case as it provides a more convincing indication than of evidence from a single source. There are 4 primary stakeholders whom evidence/data could be used to measure teaching excellence that may include:

- students and alumni;
- peers, administrators, and/or instructional specialists;
- leadership; and
- the teacher him/herself

3.5. Kind of Award

Literature advocates for providing a cash-award that requires a faculty to invest in self-professional development on teaching that ultimately improves the quality of at the student learning experience at the institution (Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education (STLHE); HEA-UK National Teaching Fellowship Scheme, 2000).

Based on the above-mentioned guidelines, TL_net recommends the Entity-based Award for Excellence in Teaching to be:

- ✓ *evidenced-based* and encourage applicants to provide evidence to support their case of excellence in teaching through an explicit criteria (use of rubrics);
- ✓ *transparent and objective*;
- ✓ *aligned to AKU's Teaching and Learning Framework and the AKU graduate attributes*; and
- ✓ *driven from best practices in the literature*.

Table 2 presents examples of different kinds of teaching awards.

EXAMPLES OF TEACHING AWARDS ENTITIES COULD CHOSE FROM TO REWARD AND RECOGNISE TEACHING EXCELLENCE (See figure 2)

Figure 2. Examples of Excellence in Teaching Awards

	Award 1 Student led Teaching Award (STA)	Award 2 Award for Innovative Teaching Practice (AITP)	Award 3 Collaborative Award for Teaching (CAT)	Award 4 Award for Exemplary Clinical Teaching (AECT)	Award 5 Exceptional Early Career Teaching Award (EECTA)	Award 6 Mentoring Award (MA)	Award 7 Excellence In Teaching Awards (ETA)
Purpose	To recognize exemplary teaching practices of those who demonstrate their commitment to delivering the best possible teaching and supervision to students, creating profound and positive educational experiences	To recognize and celebrate high-quality teaching-led innovation in higher education.	To recognize and celebrate collaborative work that has had a demonstrable impact on teaching and learning.	The Clinical Faculty Awards for Career Excellence in Clinical Teaching recognize senior Clinical Faculty members who have demonstrated contributions through excellence in clinical teaching	The purpose of the Exceptional Early Career Teaching Award is to honor new faculty members for their outstanding teaching practices.	The AKU Mentoring Award honor individual faculty members for helping to build a supportive academic environment through faculty-to-student mentoring and faculty-to-faculty mentoring.	To highlight outstanding front-line teachers of students, residents, and fellows.
Eligibility	The eligibility criteria are two-faceted: a) Full-time or Part-time faculty members who have served AKU for at-least 1 year by the time of application, are eligible to be nominated for the award. b) Faculty members who have taught at least two/three course by the time of nomination.	The eligibility criteria are two-faceted: a) Full-time or Part-time faculty members who have served AKU for at-least 1 year by the time of application, are eligible to apply for the award. b) Faculty members can also apply in teams; however, the team should be comprised of more than three members (out of three members, at least two members should be a full-time or part-time faculty members who have served AKU for at-least 1 year by the time of application). c) Inclusion of students in team is highly appreciated.	The eligibility criteria are multi-faceted: a) This is not an individual faculty award; therefore, applications from teams will be only be entertained. b) The team should be comprised of more than three members (out of three members, at least two members should be a full-time or part-time faculty members who have served AKU for at-least 1 year by the time of application). c) Inclusion of students in team is highly appreciated.	The eligibility criteria is as follows: All regular full-time or part time faculty members who are engaged in clinical teaching (in outpatient or inpatient settings) at AKU or in other associated institutions.	The eligibility criteria are two-faceted: a) Full-time or Part-time faculty members who are within first three years of their academic appointment b) The faculty member shall have had some primary classroom responsibility (e.g. co-planning, co-facilitation) for a course of undergraduate/graduate programmes.	The eligibility criteria is as follows: Full-time or Part-time faculty members who have served AKU for at-least 1 year by the time of application, are eligible to be nominated for the award	The eligibility criteria is as follows: Full-time or Part-time faculty members who have served AKU for at-least 1 year by the time of application, are eligible to be nominated for the award. Faculty members (who teach students, residents, and fellows, including volunteer faculty)
Nomination	The nomination process is as follows: 1- Student will nominate a faculty member for this award on an e-Portal created online for nomination purpose. 2- Student nominator will be required submit the nomination against the criteria for exemplary teaching with relevant examples emphasizing how the faculty has influenced students' learning. 3- Students can nominate one faculty/more than one faculty.	The nomination process is as follows: 1- Nominations can be received from students, alumni, peer, leadership, staff supporting faculty development, or self. 2- Nominator will be required to submit a two-page nominating letter evidencing on how the faculty member or the team has improved teaching and learning through innovative methods.	The nomination process is as follows: Teams can self-nominate them for this award and send their applications to the committee appointed. Nomination letter must include the details of the team members.	The nomination process is as follows: 1- Nominations can be received from students, peer, alumni, leadership, or self. 2- Nominator will be required to submit a two-page nominating letter emphasizing on the significant contribution of nominee in improving the overall clinical teaching and learning process	The nomination process is as follows: 1- Nominations can be received from students, peer, alumni, leadership, or self. 2- Only faculty member with the rank of assistant professor or higher can nominate for this award. 3- Nominator will be required to submit a two-page nominating letter	The nomination process is as follows: 1- Nominations can be received from students, peer, alumni, and/or leadership. 2- Nominator will be required to submit a two-page nominating letter evidencing why the nominee merits recognition as an outstanding mentor. Please include a clear description of the nominee's qualities as a mentor and the contributions he or she has made to the mentees' careers.	The nomination process is as follows: 1- Nominations can be received from students, peer, alumni, leadership, or self. 2- Nominator will be required to submit a two-page nominating letter emphasizing on the significant contribution of nominee by including direct quotes from learners and specific examples of teaching scenarios.

<p>Assessment Criteria and Submission Documents</p>	<p>The assessment criteria for this award is multi-fold:</p> <p>a) Student nominations via e-Portal (50%). Students will nominate faculty members against the rubric developed on the seven principles of good teaching by Chickering & Gamson (1987) with concrete examples from their classroom or learning experiences pertinent to each criteria. Nomination will be assessed quantitatively (for number of nominations received for each faculty member) as well as qualitatively (for evidence from classroom shared by students in the comment section)</p> <p>b) Student Evaluations of Teaching (SET)- Facilitator's evaluation (50%)</p> <p>c) The top three faculty members nominated by students will be asked to submit a reflective paper of 2500 words evidencing their commitment to delivering the best possible teaching, supervision to students, and creating profound and positive educational experiences for students. The reflective paper will be assessed against the rubric.</p>	<p>The assessment criteria for this award is two-fold:</p> <p>a) The applicants will be asked to submit an 'Innovative Teaching Portfolio' demonstrating contributions to advancing teaching and learning at AKU with a particular focus on innovative teaching and on providing students with innovative ways of learning. It can include some of the following themes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Curricular innovation, curricular/course design and redesign initiatives; o Development and creation of innovative teaching materials or textbooks; o Innovative teaching with technology; o Collaborative initiatives at the university level to improve quality of teaching and learning at AKU through educational innovation; o Sharing and dissemination of teaching innovations; o Other innovative educational initiatives <p>The portfolio will be assessed against the rubric.</p> <p>b) Two support letters from students and/or colleagues explaining the faculty member's or team's contribution in improving teaching practices</p> <p>c) Shortlisted awardees will be asked to conduct a seminar, workshop, or a presentation to share the innovation which had an impact on teaching and learning.</p> <p>d) Signed statement of support from Institution's dean/director (1000 words</p> <p>e) If the application is submitted by team then a Nomination form is required by team leader covering the background info about the team, team photos, institutional contact checklist and equal opportunity monitoring form should be submitted in the application</p>	<p>The assessment criteria for this award is as follows:</p> <p>a) Project teams will be asked to submit a 'portfolio' demonstrating evidence of <i>research activity or project</i> which has influenced/improved teaching and learning practices at an institutional or discipline level. The portfolio will be assessed against the rubric.</p> <p>b) Two support letters from students and/or colleagues explaining the faculty member's or team's contribution in improving teaching practices.</p> <p>c) Signed statement of support from Institution's dean/director (1000 words</p> <p>d) Nomination form (by team leader) covering the background info about the team.</p>	<p>The assessment criteria for this award is as follows</p> <p>1-Faculty member will be asked to submit a 'clinical portfolio' evidencing outstanding teaching practice in a clinical setting for medical and nursing students, residents and or other health professionals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Contributing in the professional development of students o Fostering excellence through respectful and effective communication o Supporting orientation of the learner into the professional role and the inter-professional team o Providing effective & timely feedback to facilitate professional development. o Facilitating students to develop excellence in collaboration and demonstrated professionalism o Exceptional enthusiasm for clinical teaching, demonstrating depth and breadth of knowledge and expertise - Use of best practices o Commitment to excellence patient care <p>2- Two support letters from students and/or colleagues explaining the faculty member's or team's contribution in improving teaching practices.</p> <p>3- Signed statement of support from Institution's dean/director (1000 words)</p>	<p>The assessment criteria for this award is as follows:</p> <p>a) The applicants will be asked to submit a 'Teaching Portfolio' demonstrating contributions in improving teaching practices in their discipline.</p> <p>b) Two support letters from students and/or colleagues explaining the faculty member's or team's contribution in improving teaching practices</p> <p>c) Signed statement of support from Institution's dean/director (1000 words</p>	<p>The assessment criteria for this award is as follows:</p> <p>a) The applicant will be asked to submit a teaching portfolio evidencing their contribution to improve teaching and learning as mentors. It can include of the following themes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o the career or educational productivity of mentees, o enhancement in mentee's learning as result of mentorship o the breadth and depth of mentoring across entities, disciplines departments and campuses. <p>b) Two support letters from students and/or colleagues explaining the faculty member's or team's contribution in improving teaching practices</p> <p>c) Signed statement of support from Institution's dean/director (1000 words</p>	<p>The assessment criteria for this award is as follows:</p> <p>a) Nominees will be asked to submit a 'teaching portfolio' evidencing the following tri-fold criteria as listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Teaching Excellence a. evidence of influential impact on student learning o Evidence of commitment to personal on-going professional development o Evidence of Peer Support and Development for Student Learning <p>b) Two support letters from students and/or colleagues explaining the faculty member's or team's contribution in improving teaching practices</p> <p>c) Signed statement of support from Institution's dean/director (1000 words)</p>
<p>Evaluation Process</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A panel of reviewers will be assigned to review the applications. One reviewer from the team will review 10% sample for Quality Assurance. • The panel will shortlist x number of applications and will forward their final recommendation. • The unsuccessful applications will be given a 'detailed' feedback by the reviewers on how to improve for re-submission in the next round of applications for the award. • During the assessment process, the committee may ask teams for 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A panel of reviewers will be assigned to review the applications. One reviewer from the team will review 10% sample for Quality Assurance. • The panel will shortlist x number of applications and will forward their final recommendation. • The unsuccessful applications will be given a 'detailed' feedback by the reviewers on how to improve for re-submission in the next round of applications for the award. • During the assessment process, the committee may ask teams for a short presentation on their undertaken collaborative project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A team of four reviewers will be assigned. Three reviewers review the application. Fourth reviewer reviews the 10% sample for Quality Assurance. • The panel will shortlist x number of applications and will forward their final recommendation. • During the assessment process, the committee may ask teams for a short presentation on their undertaken collaborative project. • The unsuccessful applications will be given a 'detailed' feedback by the reviewers on how to improve for re-submission in the next round of applications for the award. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A panel of reviewers will be assigned to review the applications. One reviewer from the team will review 10% sample for Quality Assurance. • The panel will shortlist x number of applications and will forward their final recommendation. • During the assessment process, the committee may ask teams for a short presentation on their undertaken collaborative project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A panel of reviewers will be assigned to review the applications. One reviewer from the team will review 10% sample for Quality Assurance. • The panel will shortlist x number of applications and will forward their final recommendation. • During the assessment process, the committee may ask teams for a short presentation on their undertaken collaborative project. • The unsuccessful applications will be given a 'detailed' feedback by the reviewers on how to improve for re-submission in the next round of applications for the award. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A panel of reviewers will be assigned to review the applications. One reviewer from the team will review 10% sample for Quality Assurance. • The panel will shortlist x number of applications and will forward their final recommendation. • During the assessment process, the committee may ask teams for a short presentation on their undertaken collaborative project. • The unsuccessful applications will be given a 'detailed' feedback by the reviewers on 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A panel of reviewers will be assigned to review the applications. One reviewer from the team will review 10% sample for Quality Assurance. • The panel will shortlist x number of applications and will forward their final recommendation. • The unsuccessful applications will be given a 'detailed' feedback by the reviewers on how to improve for re-submission in the next round of applications for the award.

	<p>a short presentation on their undertaken collaborative project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The unsuccessful applications will be given a 'detailed' feedback by the reviewers on how to improve for re-submission in the next round of applications for the award. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The unsuccessful applications will be given a 'detailed' feedback by the reviewers on how to improve for re-submission in the next round of applications for the award. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The unsuccessful applications will be given a 'detailed' feedback by the reviewers on how to improve for re-submission in the next round of applications for the award. 		<p>how to improve for re-submission in the next round of applications for the award.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> During the assessment process, the committee may ask teams for a short presentation on their undertaken collaborative project. The unsuccessful applications will be given a 'detailed' feedback by the reviewers on how to improve for re-submission in the next round of applications for the award.
Nature of Incentive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A cash Award/X form of incentive will be given to the award recipient. If the nature of incentive is cash then the amount will be used for recipient's professional development. Award recipient will be publicly recognized at the awards ceremony and will receive a 'certificate' from the university. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A cash Award/X form of incentive will be given to the award recipient. If the nature of incentive is cash then the amount will be used for used for the dissemination or extension of their innovative idea. Award recipient will be publicly recognized at the awards ceremony and will receive a 'certificate' from the university. Awardee will become ambassador of the scheme to actively promote aspects of innovation in teaching. They will act as a role model for creating and sustaining a culture of creativity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A cash Award/X form of incentive will be given to the award recipient. If the nature of incentive is cash then the amount will be used for used for the dissemination or extension of their project. Award recipient team will be publicly recognized at the awards ceremony and will receive a 'certificate' from the university. Awardee team also become ambassador of the scheme and supporting the ongoing enhancement of learning and teaching through collaborative approach. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A cash Award/X form of incentive will be given to the award recipient. If the nature of incentive is cash then the amount will be used for recipient's professional development. Award recipient will be publicly recognized at the awards ceremony and will receive a 'certificate' from the university. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A cash Award/X form of incentive will be given to the award recipient. If the nature of incentive is cash then the amount will be used for recipient's professional development. Award recipient will be publicly recognized at the awards ceremony and will receive a 'certificate' from the university 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A cash Award/X form of incentive will be given to the award recipient. If the nature of incentive is cash then the amount will be used for recipient's professional development. Award recipient will be publicly recognized at the awards ceremony and will receive a 'certificate' from the university 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A cash Award/X form of incentive will be given to the award recipient. If the nature of incentive is cash then the amount will be used for recipient's professional development. Award recipient will be publicly recognized at the awards ceremony and will receive a 'certificate' from the university
Reference	<p>Adapted from following award schemes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Higher Education Academy. (n.d.). <i>Student-led Teaching Awards (SLTAs)</i>. Cambridge University Students' Union. <i>Student-Led Teaching Awards</i>. 	<p>Adapted from following award schemes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> University of California San Francisco-UCSF- <i>Mary Anne Koda-Kimble Seed Award for Innovation</i>. University of Oxford- <i>The Vice-Chancellor's Innovation Awards</i> Ryerson University- <i>Provost's Innovative Teaching Award</i> 	<p>Adapted from following award schemes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Higher Education Academy. <i>Collaborative Award for Teaching Excellence</i>. University of Alberta. <i>Cooperation, Collaboration and Teamwork Award</i>. 	<p>Adapted from following award schemes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Association of Faculties of Medicine of Canada- <i>Clinical Teacher Award</i>. University of Ottawa. <i>PARO Award for Excellence in Clinical Teaching</i>. University of Toronto. Undergraduate Medical Education <i>Best Clinical Teaching Award</i>. 	<p>Adapted from following award schemes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> University of California San Francisco-UCSF. <i>Early Career Award</i>. University of Toronto. <i>Early Career Teaching Awards</i>. 	<p>Adapted from following award schemes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> University of California San Francisco-UCSF- <i>Lifetime Mentoring Award</i>. Emory University- <i>The Shanthi V. Sitaraman Silver Pear Mentoring Award</i>. Princeton University-The McGraw Centre of Teaching and Learning- <i>Mentoring Award</i> 	<p>Adapted from following award schemes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> University of California San Francisco-UCSF- <i>Excellence In Teaching Awards</i>

References

1. AKU Teaching & Learning Framework. (2015). *Guidelines, Policies and Procedures*. Retrieved from AGA KHAN UNIVERSITY website: <https://www.aku.edu/ctl/Documents/Updated%20Teaching%20%20Learning%20Framework.pdf>
2. Braver, J., Steinert, Y., St-Cyr, J., Watters, K., & Wood-Dauphinee, S. (2009). The significance and impact of a faculty teaching award: Disparate perceptions of department chairs and award recipients. *Medical Teacher*, 614-617. doi:01421590600878051
3. Brew, A. (2011). Higher Education Research and the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: The Pursuit of Excellence. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 5(2), 157-161. Retrieved from <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1288&context=ij-sotl>
4. Cambridge University Students' Union. (n.d.). Student-Led Teaching Awards. Retrieved from <https://www.cusu.co.uk/takeaction/student-led-teaching-awards/>
5. Chism, N.V.T. (2006) Teaching Awards: What Do They Award? *The Journal of Higher Education*. 77 (4), pp589-617.
6. Chism, N. V., & Szabo, B. L. (1997). Teaching Awards: The Problem of Assessing Their Impact. *To Improve the Academy.*, 4, 182-190. Retrieved from <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1374&context=podimproveacad> Education, 37, 188-189.
7. Emory University. (2017). The Shanthi V. Sitaraman Silver Pear Mentoring Award. Retrieved from <http://medicine.emory.edu/faculty-staff-resources/faculty-development/Sitaraman%20Silver%20Pear%20Mentoring%20Award%202018.pdf>
8. Emory University. (2017). The Shanthi V. Sitaraman Silver Pear Mentoring Award. Retrieved from <http://medicine.emory.edu/faculty-staff-resources/faculty-development/Sitaraman%20Silver%20Pear%20Mentoring%20Award%202018.pdf>
9. Gibbs, G. (2008) Conceptions of teaching excellence underlying teaching award schemes. York: Higher Education Academy.
10. Gunn, V., & Fisk, A. (2013). *Considering teaching excellence in higher education: 2007-2013*. Retrieved from Higher Education Academy (HEA) website: https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/system/files/resources/telr_final_acknowledgements.pdf
11. Higher Education Academy. (2017). Collaborative Awards for Teaching Excellence. Retrieved July 23, 2018, from <https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/cate-2017>
12. Higher Education Academy. (2018). National Teaching Fellowship. Retrieved July 23, 2018 from <https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/hea-work-area/national-teaching-fellowship-scheme>
13. Higher Education Academy. (n.d.). Collaborative Award for Teaching Excellence. Retrieved from <https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/individuals/national-teaching-fellowship-scheme/CATE>
14. Higher Education Academy. (n.d.). Student-led Teaching Awards (SLTAs). Retrieved from <https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/knowledge-hub/student-led-teaching-awards-sltas>
15. Layton, C., & Brown, C. (2011). Striking a balance: Supporting teaching excellence award applications. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 16(2), 163-174. doi:1360144X.2011.568736
16. MacKenzie, J., & Robertson, A. (2009). Teaching Excellence Awards in Scottish Higher Education. *Practice and Evidence of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 4(1), 26-40 26. Retrieved from <https://community.dur.ac.uk/pesthe.learning/index.php/pesthe/article/download/29/45>
17. Mackenzie, N. (2007). Teaching Excellence Awards: An Apple for the Teacher? *Australian Journal of Education*, 51(2), 194-201. doi:000494410705100207
18. Medicine, V. (n.d.). Teaching Excellence Awards - Awards and Recognition - VCU School of Medicine. Retrieved from <https://medschool.vcu.edu/facultyaffairs/awards/teachingawards/>
19. Princeton University-The McGraw Centre of Teaching and Learning. (n.d.). Mentoring Award. Retrieved from <https://mcgraw.princeton.edu/graduate-students/mentoring-award>
20. Ryerson University. (2017). Provost's Innovative Teaching Award. Retrieved from https://www.ryerson.ca/lt/awards/provosts_award/innovative/
21. Schindler, N., Corcoran, J. C., Miller, M., Wang, C. H., Roggin, K., Posner, M., ... DaRosa, D. A. (2013). Implementing an excellence in teaching recognition system: Needs analysis and recommendations. *J Surg Educ*, 70(6), 731-8. doi: 10.1016/j.jsurg.2013.05.002
22. Shephard, K., Stein, S., Tidswell, T., & Harland, T. (2010). Preparing an application for a higher-education teaching-excellence award: whose foot fits Cinderella's shoe? *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 33:(1), 47-56. doi:1360080X.2011.537011
23. Skelton, A. (2003). Promoting 'teaching excellence' through fellowship schemes. *Medical*
24. Skelton, A. (2004) Understanding 'teaching excellence' in higher education: a critical evaluation of the National Teaching Fellowships Scheme, *Studies in Higher Education*, 29:4, 451-468, DOI: 10.1080/0307507042000236362
25. Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education (STLHE). (n.d.). STLHE - 3M National Teaching Fellowship. Retrieved from <https://www.stlhe.ca/awards/3m-national-teaching-fellowships/>
26. TEACH: Participant Handbook. (2018). *Network of Teaching & Learning*. Aga Khan University.
27. Thompson, S., & Zaitseva, E. (2013). *Reward and Recognition: Student Led Teaching Awards Report*. Retrieved from Higher Education Academy (HEA) website: <https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/system/files/resources/reward-recognition-slt-report.pdf>
28. Thornton, T. (2014). Professional recognition: Promoting recognition through the Higher Education Academy in a UK higher education institution. 20:3, pages. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 20(3), 225-238.
29. UCSF-Medical Education. (2017). Cooke awards for scholarship of teaching and learning. Retrieved July 23, 2018, from <https://meded.ucsf.edu/faculty-educators/recognition-and-awards/academy/cooke-awards>
30. UCSF-Medical Education. (n.d.). Excellence in teaching awards. Retrieved July 23, 2018, from <https://meded.ucsf.edu/faculty-educators/recognition-and-awards/academy-awards-and-recognition/excellence-teaching-awards>
31. University of California San Francisco-UCSF. (2017). Early Career Award. Retrieved from <https://pharmacy.ucsf.edu/news/2016/12/bo-huang-wins-2016-early-career-award>
32. University of California San Francisco-UCSF. (2017). Lifetime Mentoring Award. Retrieved from <https://www.ucsf.edu/news/2018/06/410916/patricia-osullivan-receives-2018-ucsf-lifetime-mentoring-award>
33. University of California San Francisco-UCSF. (n.d.). Mary Anne Koda-Kimble Seed Award for Innovation. Retrieved from <https://pharmacy.ucsf.edu/about/honors-awards/seed>

33. University of California, San Francisco (UCSF). (2015). A Faculty Handbook For Success. Advancement and Promotion at UCSF. Retrieved from <https://senate.ucsf.edu/sites/default/files/2016-12/FacultyHandbook-UCSF.pdf>
34. University of Ottawa. (2017). PARO Award for Excellence in Clinical Teaching. Retrieved from <https://med.uottawa.ca/postgraduate/news/paro-award-excellence-clinical-teaching>
35. University of Oxford. (2018). The Vice-Chancellor's Innovation Awards Guidance Notes. Retrieved from <http://www.ox.ac.uk/research/innovation-awards>
36. University of Toronto. (2016). Undergraduate Medical Education Best Clinical Teaching Award. Retrieved from <http://www.radonc.utoronto.ca/undergraduate-medical-education-best-clinical-teaching-award>
37. University of Toronto. (n.d.). Early Career Teaching Awards. Retrieved from <https://www.utsc.utoronto.ca/ctl/university-toronto-early-career-teaching-awards>