Call for Strickler Innovation in Instruction Award Submissions Due April 15, 2023

ARIA members and others interested in risk management and insurance education are invited to submit proposals detailing innovations 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 inside or outside the classroom, lecture-based innovations, and development of case materials, class projects, or other unique teaching materials. For a list of previous award winners that have recently published, please see https://www.aria.org/strickler-award.

All proposals will be evaluated based on innovation, student engagement, external stakeholder engagement (where applicable), 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 or ease for ARIA members to adopt the innovation within their programs. Proposals that have high potential for improving RMI education broadly not only have high education 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 website address confirming availability for public use.

A monetary award of $1,000 is associated with the Strickler Award and will be presented at the 2023 Annual Meeting. Persons submitting proposals agree that if selected as the winner, they will attend the in-person meeting in Washington, DC August 6 - 9, 2023, to present their innovative idea in a special session.

Proposals are due **April 15, 2023,** and will be judged by the Les B. Strickler Awards Committee. Proposals should include a cover letter that identifies the submitter's name, address, daytime phone number, and employer-affiliation of corresponding submitter. 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 that address all the criteria in the rubric will be evaluated more favorably. External letters or evaluations attesting to any of the required attributes / criteria may also be submitted.

Submit all materials for review as a single e-mail attachment to the Strickler Committee chair, Mary Kelly: mkelly@wlu.ca. Hard copies will not be accepted.

Good luck and we look forward to hearing from you!

	Rating:	1	2	3	4	5
Innovation and engagement	**Innovation**	• Not innovative or original	• Not very innovative or original	• Some level of innovation	• Very innovative	• Extremely innovative
	Student engagement	• Limited student engagement	• Marginal student engagement	• Some student engagement	• Good potential for student engagement	• High potential for student engagement
	External engagement	• External engagement not relevant	• External engagement not important	• Limited potential for external engagement	• Some potential for external engagement	• Engages alumni and / or other stakeholders
Content	**Relevance**	• Not related to RMI	• Minimal RMI content	• Some RMI content	• Good level of RMI content	• Significant RMI content
	Timeliness	• Content is extremely dated	• Content is somewhat dated	• Content is somewhat current	• Content is current (or timeless)	• Content is new / emerging
Potential for improving RMI education broadly	**Educational Value**	• No educational value	• Little educational value	• Some education value.	• Good education value	• Significant educational value.
	Applicability (level of study)	• 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.)
	Adoptability (field of study)	• 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
	Applicability (jurisdictional)	• 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
Transferability	**Ease of Adoption**	• 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
Presentation	**Quality of annual meeting presentation**	• 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
Complete Submission	**Submission has all required elements**	• 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