

## Les B. Strickler Innovation in Instruction Award Call for Proposals

ARIA members and others interested in risk management and insurance education are invited to submit proposals detailing innovative ideas that they have developed and used in risk management and insurance instruction.

Proposals can include any effective, creative approach used in teaching risk management and insurance. For example, creative ideas might include new course offerings, alternative methods of evaluation, experiential projects outside the classroom, lecture-based innovation, and development of case materials, class projects, or other unique teaching materials. Innovations should not be limited to technological advances or computer applications. For a list of previous award winners, please see [Les B Strickler Innovation in Instruction award](#).

All proposals will be evaluated on the basis of innovation, student and potentially external stakeholder engagement, the relevance and timeliness of the material to risk management and insurance education, the potential of the submission to improve RMI education more broadly and the ability of interested ARIA members to easily adopt the material within their programs. Submissions that include all relevant teaching material, for example slide deck, teaching notes, and grading rubrics, have been viewed favourably in the past.

Proposals that have high potential for improving RMI education broadly not only have high educational value but can be applied across different levels of study (undergraduate, graduate and doctoral), across a wide range of courses and are not limited to one jurisdiction.

Proposals that rely upon a publication or other commercial product should attach documentation from the holder of that copyright or trademark providing written agreement to having the product transferred in the manner described in the proposal. If obtained from a website, please provide the website address confirming availability for public use.

A monetary award of up to \$1,000 is associated with the Strickler Award and will be presented at the 2026 Annual Meeting. Persons submitting proposals agree that if selected as the winner, they will attend the ARIA meeting in Orlando, Florida August 2 - 5, 2026, to present their innovative idea.

Proposals are due **April 10, 2026**, and will be judged by the Les B. Strickler Award Committee. The reward recipient will be announced by **May 7, 2026**.

Proposals should include a cover letter that identifies the submitter's name, address, daytime phone number, and employer-affiliation. The remaining documentation should in no way identify the author(s) of the proposal. The proposal should highlight the purpose of the innovation and a description of the course in which the innovation has been used. The proposals themselves will be evaluated using the rubric presented at the end of this call. As such, proposals should address all the attributes in the rubric. External letters or evaluations attesting to any of the required attributes may also be submitted.

Please submit the cover letter and remaining documentation in two e-mail attachments to the Strickler Committee chair, Faith Neale: [frneale@charlotte.edu](mailto:frneale@charlotte.edu). Hard copies will not be accepted.

Good luck and we look forward to hearing from you!

Rating:		1	2	3	4	5
<b>Innovation and engagement</b>	<b>Innovation</b>	● Not innovative or original	● Not very innovative or original	● Some level of innovation	● Very innovative	● Extremely innovative
	<b>Student engagement</b>	● Limited student engagement	● Marginal student engagement	● Some student engagement	● Good potential for student engagement	● High potential for student engagement
	<b>External engagement</b>	● External engagement not relevant	● External engagement not important	● Limited potential for external engagement	● Some potential for external engagement	● Engages alumni and / or other stakeholders
<b>Content</b>	<b>Relevance</b>	● Not related to RMI	● Minimal RMI content	● Some RMI content	● Good level of RMI content	● Significant RMI content
	<b>Timeliness</b>	● Content is extremely dated	● Content is somewhat dated	● Content is somewhat current	● Content is current (or timeless)	● Content is new / emerging
<b>Potential for improving RMI education broadly</b>	<b>Educational Value</b>	● No educational value	● Little educational value	● Some education value.	● Good education value	● Significant educational value.
	<b>Applicability (level of study)</b>	● Relevant to very small subset of learners (e.g., doctoral students)	● Relevant to one fairly large group of learners (e.g., intro undergrad only)	● Potential to adapt across a few years of study (e.g., senior undergrad and introductory master's)	● Potential to adapt across introductory and advanced undergrad courses or masters or PhD courses	● Potential to adapt across all degree levels (u/g, masters and PhD.)
	<b>Adoptability (field of study)</b>	● Potential to adopt in a very limited number of courses across a very limited number of institutions	● Potential to adopt in a few courses across some institutions	● Potential to adopt for common RMI course across most institutions (e.g. Intro, Operations)	● Potential to adopt for different RMI courses at most institutions	● Potential to adopt for RMI courses and potentially other business / actuarial science courses at most institutions
	<b>Applicability (jurisdictional)</b>	● Applicable to single jurisdiction (e.g, single state)	● Applicable to one country	● Applicable or easily adaptable to most jurisdictions	● Easily adaptable to any jurisdiction	● No jurisdictional constraints
<b>Transferability</b>	<b>Ease of Adoption</b>	● Not enough material provided to allow other instructors to adopt content	● Would be difficult for other instructors to adopt content due to missing material (slide deck, teaching notes, grading rubrics, etc.)	● Some relevant material provided (slide deck, slide deck, grading rubrics, etc.) allowing other instructors to potentially integrate some content	● Most relevant material provided (slide deck, slide deck, grading rubrics, etc.) allowing other instructors to potentially integrate most content	● All relevant material provided (slide deck, teaching notes, grading rubrics, etc.) allowing other instructors to easily integrate content
<b>Presentation</b>	<b>Quality of annual meeting presentation</b>	● Not enough content for length of presentation	● Probably not enough content for length of presentation	● Potentially enough content for length of presentation	● Most likely enough content for length of presentation	● Sufficient depth and breadth of content for presentation
<b>Complete Submission</b>	<b>Submission has all required elements</b>	● Many elements missing ● Not well laid out or referenced	● Some elements missing ● Could be better laid out and referenced	● Missing critical element ● Fairly well laid out and easy to follow.	● Minor elements missing ● Well laid out and easy to follow	● Complete submission, all elements present ● Well laid out and easy to follow

