

EDWARD PENSON DISTINGUISHED TEACHING AWARD
SELECTION PROCEDURE

1. Evaluations will be conducted using the rubric provided.
2. Committee members are encouraged to note their rationales for component scores for discussion purposes.
3. Committee members must score all applicants or refrain from submitting scores for any nominee.
4. Scores from the rubrics will be tallied by the Recording Secretary assigned to the committee. Scores are summed.
5. The committee will meet to review the scores, discuss outliers, and resolve any ties. Ranks will not be changed.
6. Discussion will be based solely on the evidence submitted by the nominee. Those with a potential conflict of interest must abstain from discussing the qualifications of that nominee.
7. The highest scoring candidates will be nominated to the Provost by the chair.

EDWARD PENSON DISTINGUISHED TEACHING AWARD
ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

Applicant name: [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

Faculty:

Instructional Academic Staff:

Date joined UWO: [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

Average credits/year for last 3 years: [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

Teaching this academic year No: Yes:

Submitted CV (5 page max) No: Yes:

Submitted at least 3 letters of support from students, alumni, and teaching colleagues (to meet nomination requirements) No: Yes:

Submitted at least 50% SOS reports for last 3 years No: Yes:

CANDIDATE MEETS NOMINATION CRITERIA: No: Yes:

If no, submission is not scored.

EDWARD PENSON DISTINGUISHED TEACHING AWARD RUBRIC
SELECTION CRITERIA

POINTS (compared to other nominees)

Outstanding 9-10
Above average 7-8
Average 5-6
Below average 2-4
Uncompetitive 0-1

“No” items receive a 0. Instructional Academic Staff are not required to submit evidence for the last two criteria listed below. However, if they have teaching related professional/scholarly growth or service, those criteria should be scored and added to the total. When examples are provided, they are not limiting or exhaustive. There are many ways to demonstrate excellence in teaching beyond those listed. Does the nominee clearly communicate how they excel over their peers? Committee members will evaluate each candidate based solely on submitted documents without reference to any personal knowledge.

Discusses teaching responsibilities for past 3 years (narrative)?

No: Yes: If yes, then score: i.e., Excels in study abroad, teaching pit classes, offers additional educational opportunities over and above load, or demonstrates teaching excellence in other settings, such as one-on-one individual instruction.

Score: [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

One-page maximum teaching philosophy?

No: Yes: If yes, then score: i.e., Creative teaching (introduces diversity, technology, etc.), unique methods of student engagement, etc.

Score: [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

Data from student evaluations (SOS).

Score: 5-6 = consistently at or below University average; 7-8 = consistently above University average; 9-10 = consistently substantially above University average.

Score: [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

Evidence of professional and scholarly growth linked to TEACHING excellence?

No: Yes: If yes, then score: i.e., Involvement of students in research and/or other creative scholarly projects, publications related to pedagogy, pedagogical workshops or presentations, etc.

Score: [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

Service to the unit, university, the community, and beyond and linked to TEACHING excellence?

No: Yes: If yes, then score: i.e., Special programming for student education, CAPP program, teaching committees, etc.

Score: [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

Total Score: [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)