**Awards for Teaching Excellence – Year …………….**

(Application Form and Annexes)

**(Scheme is given in Annex 1)**

**Name:**

**Designation:**

**Department:**

**Faculty:**

**Required Credit Load:** (X)

**1. Student Evaluation (Minimum of 3 marks required from this)**

Note: Prepare separate set of 2 tables for each course evaluated

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Course Code | Credit rating1 | (A) Student enrolment | Total credit load2 | Lecturers involved  (Applicant’s name first) | How Credits are shared | Head’s  Initial |
|  |  |  |  |  | (Y) |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

Note 1- Indicate only rating for which evaluation has been conducted (e.g. excluding practicals)

Note 2 – Calculate as indicated in the computation of student credits (Annexe 2)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Course Code | (B) Total respondents3 | Overall Evaluation Results  (No. of respondents) | | | | | Weighted Score (P) | (Q) x {Y/X}3a | Head’s  Initial |
| VP=1 | P=2 | AV=3 | G=4 | VG=5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Note 3 – B/A should be not less than 0.6

Note 3a – If 3.5<P<4.49 then Q = 3; If P >= 4.50 then Q = 5

**2. Peer Evaluation (Minimum of 1 mark required for this)**

Note: Prepare separate set of 2 tables for each course evaluated

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Course Code | Credit rating1 | (A) Student enrolment | Total credit load2 | Lecturers involved  (Applicant’s name first) | How Credits are shared | Head’s  Initial |
|  |  |  |  |  | (Y) |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

Note 1- Indicate only rating for which evaluation has been conducted (e.g. excluding practicals)

Note 2 – Calculate as indicated in the computation of student credits (Annexe 2)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Course Code | Peer (should be moderator; if not give reasons) & signature | Marks if (marked by peer & Head)4 | | | Total score  (P) | (P) x {Y/X} | Head’s  Initial |
| Carried out | No improve-  ment reqd | Improved for 2 yrs |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Note 4: if carried out – 1 mark

if carried out and no improvements are requested by peer - up to additional 2 marks

if improvements have been made and certified by Head of Department – up to additional 2 marks (peer evaluations in at least 2 years have to be done for this; no double counting for this as innovations)

**3. Lecture Notes and Course Material (Minimum of 2 marks required for this)**

Note: Prepare separate set of 2 tables for each course evaluated

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Course Code | Credit rating1 | (A) Student enrolment | Total credit load2 | Lecturers involved  (Applicant’s name first) | How Credits are shared | Head’s  Initial |
|  |  |  |  |  | (Y) |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

1- Indicate only rating for which evaluation has been conducted (e.g. excluding practicals)

2 – Calculate as indicated in the computation of student credits (Annexe 2)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Course Code | Peer (should be moderator; if not give reasons) & signature | Comments by peer – “satisfactory”, “good”, “very good” | Total overall score (P)5 | (P) x {Y/X} | Head’s  Initial |
|  |  | lecture notes -  e-learning modules -  assignments –  others (state) - |  |  |  |

5 - if “satisfactory” – 0 marks; if “good” – 2 marks; if “very good” – 3 marks

**4. Innovations**

Marks & Initial (Head)

List Innovations

List New Courses

Marks to be given by Head as per Annexe 1; please ensure that at least 2 batches have experienced the innovation and/or new course. Also note that marks suggest are maxima, and every innovation and/or new course may not deserve the full mark.

**5. Overall Student Assessment**

This will be carried out centrally.

**6. Scholarship in Pedagogy (Maximum of 3 marks)**

List papers and marks claimed, strictly as per Annexe 3 noting year of publication **but Annexe 3 marks should be halved**. (Publications in years 2012, 2013 and 2014 can be considered, weighted as per Annexe 3)

…………………………………. ………………………..

**Signature of Applicant DateAnnexe 1 - Awards for Teaching Excellence - Scheme**

Initially, this should be used only for undergraduate teaching, and carried out for a given academic (not calendar) year.

**1. Student Evaluation (Minimum of 3 marks required from this)**

- should have been carried out on form prescribed by Department/Faculty/University

- should have been carried out and analyzed by Head of Department or nominee

- should be carried out for each teacher separately, if course is shared

- can be carried out for each course taught by teacher

- at least 60% of registered students for the course must be sampled

- on a five level scale of “Very poor, Poor, Average, Good, Very Good”, if the Mean score1 corresponds to:

Good – 3 marks

Very Good – 5 marks

Marks to be factored by “(Credit load for which teacher is responsible)/(Required credit load)”

**2. Peer Evaluation (Minimum of 1 mark required for this)**

- should have been carried out on form prescribed by Department/Faculty/University

- should have been carried out by peer appointed by Council on the recommendation of the Senate, Faculty and Head of Department (along with appointment of Examiners and Moderators)

- can be carried out for each course taught by teacher

- if carried out – 1 mark

if carried out and no improvements are requested by peer - up to additional 2 marks

if improvements have been made and certified by Head of Department – up to additional 2 marks (peer evaluations in at least 2 years have to be done for this; no double counting for this as innovations)

- Marks to be factored by “(Credit load for which teacher is responsible)/(Required credit load)”

*Note :* *The Council decided that the Moderator of the Module being taught by a Teacher will act as the peer Evaluation.*

**3. Lecture Notes and Course Material (Minimum of 2 marks required for this)**

- course material such as lecture notes, e-learning modules, assignments (practicals, courseworks, drawings etc), as applicable to be evaluated by peer

- should have been carried out by peer appointed by Council on the recommendation of the Senate, Faculty and Head of Department (along with appointment of Examiners and Moderators)

- if “satisfactory” – 0 marks; if “good” – 2 marks; if “very good” – 3 marks

- Marks to be factored by “(Credit load for which teacher is responsible)/(Required credit load)”

**4. Innovations**

- Innovations to teaching made – can be course element (syllabus or practical); material (printed or electronic); technique (teaching or assessment) - up to 2 marks per innovation, as recommended by Head of Department & judged by Awards selection committee

- New course – up to (1 x no. of credits) marks, depending on course material, syllabus design, novelty & appropriateness of course etc., as recommended by Head of Department & judged by Awards selection committee

- Marks can only be obtained for the second year of operation of the innovation, after Head of Department certifies that 2 batches of students have found it useful, with few or no adverse comments

**5. Overall Student Assessment**

- Graduands to be asked (when supplicating) to fill form with names of teachers who helped them learn through each category below (1 teacher allowed per category):

Classroom/laboratory communication

Printed notes/electronic media

Promotion of peer interaction (e.g. through group work)

Assignments set and individual feedback given

Supervision of project work

Mentoring and role modelling

- Number of times a teacher has been mentioned to be aggregated. If any teacher falls

within to 50% - 1 mark

within top 25% - additional 1 mark

provided a teacher has been named at least 25 times

**6. Scholarship in Pedagogy (Maximum of 3 marks)**

- Publishing of research in education and pedagogy – criteria as per research awards scheme, but marks to be half the value as in that scheme.

**7. Required Score for Award**

- 10 marks

- As this scheme is very difficult to implement unambiguously, the first 2-3 years may have to be done on an experimental basis, inclusive of defining the target score. In the first year of operation, the selection committee may change the target mark by +/- 2; in subsequent years, the target mark declared when calling for applications for the award shall not be changed during the selection process.

*Notes:*

*1 – The categories Very poor, Poor, Average, Good, Very Good to be assigned points of 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5. If the weighted average lies between 3.50 and 4.49, it corresponds to “Good”; if it is 4.50 or above, it corresponds to “Very Good”.*

*2 - Required credit load will vary from faculty to faculty, as approved by the Senate.*

**Annexe 2 - COMPUTATION OF STUDENT CREDITS**

**Academic Accountability**

On the basis that our degree programmes require students to earn 150 credits to graduate in four years and 120 credits to graduate in three years, and the Student: Staff ratio is maintained at ten, the average workload of a staff member works out to be 375 **Student Credits** (SC) per year.

**Computation of Student Credits: Lectures**

**SC = SC b × AF × CW × Pc**

**Computation of Student Credits: Practical and Field Work, Research Supervision, CDP etc.**

**SC = Number of Students × CW × Pc**

Where:

**SC =** Student Credits

**SC b** (Base Student Credits) = 50

**CW** (Credit Weighting of Lecture/Practical/Field Work/ Research component) = 1, 2, 3, 4, etc.

**AF** (Adjustment Factor) = a multiplicative factor for equalizing **workload differences** due to class size (**See Table attached**)

**Pc** = Proportional Contribution made by the staff member (1, ¼, ½, ¾, ⅓, ⅔ etc.)

***Adjustment Factors for Class Size of Lectures***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Class Size \*** | **AF** |
| 15-24 | 0.6 |
| 25-34 | 0.7 |
| 35-39 | 0.8 |
| 40-44 | 0.9 |
| 45-54 | 1.0 |
| 55-64 | 1.1 |
| 65-74 | 1.2 |
| 75-84 | 1.3 |
| 85-94 | 1.4 |
| 95-104 | 1.5 |
| 105-114 | 1.6 |
| 115-124 | 1.7 |
| 125-134 | 1.8 |
| 135-144 | 1.9 |
| 145-154 | 2.0 |
| 155-164 | 2.1 |
| 165-174 | 2.2 |
| 175-184 | 2.3 |
| 185-194 | 2.4 |
| 195-204 | 2.5 |
| 205-214 | 2.6 |
| 215-224 | 2.7 |
| 225-234 | 2.8 |
| 235-249 | 2.9 |
| ≥ 250 | 3.0 |

\* Lectures conducted for Class Sizes less than 15 will not be listed in Master Timetable and provision of resources will be Department’s responsibility

**Annexe 3 – Details of the Marking Scheme (Research Awards)**

### A.1 Marking Scheme:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Type of Publication/Patent** | | **Sole Author** | **Co-Authored with** | | |
| **Senior Staff/ *Co-worker*** | **Postgraduate students** | **Undergraduate students** |
| 1. | Publications in abstracted or indexed journals | 6.0 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 4.8 |
| 2. | Publications in non-abstracted or non-indexed journals, international conferences and Annual Sessions of recognized professional institutions, in which full paper is refereed and published. (See Note 14) | 4.0 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 3.2 |
| 3. | Publications in national conferences and seminars in which full paper is refereed and published (See Note 14) | 2.0 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.6 |
| 4. | Patents supported each by a peer reviewed published paper which demonstrates the technology/methodology that resulted in the innovation (See Note 6) | 4.0 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 3.2 |
| 5. | Patents | 2.0 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.6 |

### A.2 Qualifying Requirement:

The requirement to qualify for an award is a minimum total of 12 marks (rounded off to the nearest first digit) where the weightage given for the most recent year is 1.0, the middle year is 0.75, and the most distant year is 0.5.

### A.3 Explanatory Notes:

**Note 1 :**

Some examples below explain the application of this marking scheme.

Example 1(Sole author): Most recent year = 01 paper of Type 1, middle year = No papers, and most distant year = 2 papers of Type 1.

=6x1x1 + 6x0x0.75 + 6x2x0.5 = 12.0 (Qualifies)

Example 2(Sole author): Most recent year = 1 paper of Type 2, middle year = 2 papers of Type 2, and most distant year 1 paper of Type 2.

= 4x1x1 + 4x2x0.75 + 4x1x0.5 = 12.0 (Qualifies)

Example 3(Sole author): Most recent year = 1 paper of Type 3, middle year = 4 papers of Type 3, and most distant year 4 papers of Type 3.

= 2x1x1 + 2x4x0.75 + 2x4x0.5 = 12.0 (Qualifies)

Example 4(with other senior staff/postgraduates): Most recent year = 1 paper of Type 1, middle year = 1 paper of Type 1, and most distant year 3 papers of Type 1.

= 3.6x1x1 + 3.6x1x0.75 + 3.6x3x0.5 = 11.7 (Qualifies)

**Note 2 :**

All details relevant to the assessment of the applications as per approved guidelines should be provided for evaluation. In case of each paper/patent an applicants must submit a declaration as indicate in Appendix C .

**Note 3 :**

For the “Type 1” publications abstracting/indexing journals are considered to be journals abstracted/indexed by internationally recognized Abstracting/Indexing Authorities.

* EI Compendex
* Science Citation index
* Applied Mechanics Reviews
* INSPEC (Electrical and Electronic Abstracts and Computer Control Abstracts)
* Science Citation Index Expanded
* Cambridge Scientific Abstracts
* EBSCO Host
* INGENTA
* Arts and Humanities Citation Index
* Social Sciences Citation Index

In case an applicant wishes to claim marks for a publication in the “Type 1” category, but the journal referred to is not in the above list, then the applicant should make a specific application giving adequate reasons to consider such a journal as an indexed journal for the award of Senate Research Grants. Senate Research Committee would consider each case and if necessary, make recommendations to the Senate to grant approval.

**Note 4 :**

Publications based only on research for postgraduate qualifications will not be counted.

**Note 5**

For all electronic publications whether in CD or on web, each applicant should submit a hard copy of such publication showing its electronically published form satisfactory to the Senate Research Committee. Adequate evidence should be provided to indicate that such a publication is equivalent or better than a printed publication. All electronic publications whether in CD or on web should also fulfill other requirements as per the approved guidelines for submission of an application.

**Note 6 :**

In the case of “Type 4”, the applicant is eligible to claim half the marks appropriate for the publication, which deals with the patent, under the appropriate category of publications.

**Note 7 :**

In the case of “Types 4 and 5” patents, “demand” patents are excluded.

**Note 8 :**

In case of patents, applicants must clearly indicate that the concerned patent does not fall in to the category of **on demand patents**.

**Note 9:**

Only publications made while in University service are eligible for consideration. This means that at least the research work or the task of writing the paper should be done while in University Service. Here the University service is construed to mean the possession of a permanent academic staff position in the Library or the three Faculties of this University.

**Note 10:**

If the applicant is not the sole author, category of each co-author (whether Senior Staff/ Co-worker, Postgraduate student, or Undergraduate student) should be clearly indicated.

**Note 11 :**

Copies of all the published papers, for which marks are claimed by the applicant, should be submitted along with the application. Applicants are not eligible to furnish additional/supplementary information other than with the completed application. Only one application per person will be accepted.

**Note 12 :**

Any clarifications regarding the application/details requested could be obtained prior to the closing date of application. Applicants are advised to provide all details in full. University would not accept responsibility to search for evidence on behalf of an applicant using provided web links or otherwise.

**Note 13 :**

For papers or patents with a research team of five or more, marks earned will be subjected to a reduction factor of 0.50. Alternatively, marks can be assigned in proportion to the actual contribution of the applicant. For this purpose, the applicant should produce a signed statement by all other members of the research team stating the applicant’s contribution to the paper or patent, expressed as a percentage.

In no case should the marks assigned exceed those in the table.

**Note 14 :**

A conference may be known by the names such as Symposium, Seminar, Colloquium, Forum, Workshop, Congress and Sessions. To consider a publication, author should submit along with the application: (a) evidence of acceptance of the paper after a process of peer review; (b) a copy of the published full paper; (c) a copy of the “Title Page” of the conference proceedings; and (d) the “Content Pages” of the Conference proceedings.