

# Collaborative Award for Teaching Excellence (CATE) 2020

## Guidance for Reviewers

# Contents

1.	Introduction	3
1.1	New for 2020	3
2.	Preparation for Review	4
3.	Nomination Documents	4
3.1	Parts of the nomination for review	5
3.2	Nominated Team Claim	5
3.3	Statement of Support	6
4.	Process	7
4.1	Roles and responsibilities of reviewers	7
4.2	Allocation and access to papers	7
4.3	Conflicts of interest	7
4.4	Monitoring of equality and diversity data	8
4.5	Deadlines	8
4.6	Allocating Scores to Section B of the Claim	9
4.7	Giving feedback	9
5	CATE 2020 Award Criteria	13
6	Evidencing the CATE Award criteria	16
7	CATE 2020 Scoring Rubric	17
8	Outcomes	18
	Appendix 1: CATE 2020 Privacy Statement	19

## 1. Introduction

**These guidelines are for peer reviewers for the Collaborative Award for Teaching Excellence (CATE) 2020.** This guidance document provides detailed information about the judging of CATE nominations to guide and assist you in the process of reviewing, scoring and providing feedback.

The purpose of the Collaborative Award for Teaching Excellence (CATE) is to recognise and celebrate collaborative work that has had a demonstrable impact on teaching and learning. Introduced in 2016, the scheme highlights the key role that teamwork plays in higher education. Each Award will recognise a team which has enabled a change in practice for colleagues or students at an institutional or discipline level. There is no limit on the size of the team. Up to 15 teams will be selected to receive the award in 2020.

All UK Advance HE member institutions are eligible to enter one team that **teaches and/or supports learning in Higher Education (HE)**. Teams selected to enter the CATE are called '**nominated teams**' as their institution has chosen to put them forward for an Award via a '**nomination**'.

The CATE scheme is organised and run by Advance HE. Advance HE was formed in March 2018, following the merger of the Equality Challenge Unit, the Higher Education Academy and the Leadership Foundation for Higher Education. Advance HE continues the work of the former Higher Education Academy (HEA) in organising and running the CATE scheme.

Peer review is an essential part of the CATE selection process. Advance HE and the UK Teaching Excellence Awards Advisory Panel ("the Panel") rely on the reviewers' assessment to enable them to recommend which teams will be selected as winners of the Award, and thus are grateful to you for the professional time and energy that you contribute to the success of this scheme. Feedback provided is also an important part of the development process for nominated teams.

Advance HE uses its virtual learning environment (VLE) for the review process. You will use the VLE to access the documents and to submit your scores and feedback.

There have been a small number of changes to the reviewer guidance this year, which are outlined below. If you do have further questions or queries please contact the Teaching Excellence Awards Team either by email [cate@advance-he.ac.uk](mailto:cate@advance-he.ac.uk) or by telephone 01904 717500.

The full guidance for nominated teams and institutions applying in 2020 is also available on our [website](#).

We hope you find the review process straightforward. If you do have further questions or queries during the process of reviewing, please contact the Teaching Excellence Awards Team either by email [cate@advance-he.ac.uk](mailto:cate@advance-he.ac.uk) or by telephone 01904 717500.

**PLEASE NOTE: If you are part of a nominated team for CATE in 2020, you cannot be a reviewer for CATE in 2020.**

### 1.1 New for 2020

There are no changes to the CATE criteria or processes in 2020, but this year's Reviewer Guidance includes some additional instruction and clarifications, which are outlined here:

For 2020, further guidance has been provided to nominated teams in relation to Section A of the claim - the Context Statement, Section C - the Reference List, and the Institutional

Statement of Support. For your information some of this additional guidance has been included in this document and is explained in relation to the reviewing process. We have also included a link to the 2020 Guidance for institutions and teams. See 3.2.1 and 3.2.3, and 3.3.

- A small number of additional points have been added to the guidance on giving feedback (Sections 4.7.1 and 4.7.2);
- Further guidance has been provided to help reviewers and nominated teams/nominees to identify evidence of 'reach', 'value' and 'impact' (see section 5)
- Further information has been provided on what is meant by 'collaborative' and guidance included to help reviewers to identify evidence of collaborative practice, to support scoring Criterion 1 (see section 5)
- A number of minor changes have been made to wording throughout the guidance.

## 2. Preparation for Review

In 2020, Advance HE will send nominations to a selection of peer reviewers who have successfully completed a moderation exercise and attended a CATE reviewer webinar session in 2019 or 2020.

As part of the ongoing development of the scheme, new reviewers will be recruited in 2020 to work alongside some of those who reviewed in 2019. If you completed the moderation exercise in 2019, and attended the webinar, you are still welcome to participate in the 2020 moderation exercise, but are not required to do so. However, please note the changes to the guidance identified in section 1.1. above.

It will therefore be understood that all reviewers are familiar with the CATE nomination requirements and format, the two CATE Award criteria and the Scoring Rubric (section 7, Table 3) that you will apply during the review process. All information relating to the review process has been included in this document but you are encouraged to cross reference this with the nomination requirements and guidance detailed in the [CATE 2020 Guidance for institutions and nominated teams](#), which supports teams to develop their nomination.

Training will be offered annually and it is anticipated that for future iterations of CATE, reviewers wishing to continue to support the Award will be expected to participate in a moderation exercise and training at least every 2 years. This is intended to support consistency and ongoing development of the Award, provide opportunities for new reviewers, and provide an opportunity for experienced reviewers to refresh their skills and understanding. We hope that you find this useful.

## 3. Nomination Documents

Nominations consist of a series of documents and online forms; in addition to the Nominated Team Claim and institutional Statement of Support, each document/form has a specific purpose, e.g. equality and diversity monitoring, publicity for Award winners, a checklist for Institutional Contacts, etc.

### 3.1 Parts of the nomination for review

As a reviewer, you will only receive the following documents:

**Nominated Team Claim**

**Statement of Support**

### 3.2 Nominated Team Claim

In 2020 the Claim has 3 sections,

- + Section A: Context Statement (maximum 300 words);
- + Section B: Claim against the CATE Award Criteria (maximum 3500 words across both criteria);
- + Section C: Reference List

**Only Section B of the Claim, containing evidence against the two CATE Award criteria, is scored by reviewers.**

Section A (“Context Statement”) and Section C (“Reference List”) provide added information to help you review the Claim, but should not be scored.

#### 3.2.1 Section A: Context Statement

There will be considerable variation between nominated teams, reflecting differences in the constitution, context and work of the team. The Context Statement (up to 300 words), which was new for 2019, is at the beginning of the team’s Claim and will not be scored by reviewers. Teams will use this new section to articulate the context, setting, field and/or area of work within which the team is operating. Further guidance, including short examples, on what to include in the context statement has been provided for nominated teams in section 4.1 of the [CATE 2020 – Guidance for institutions and teams](#).

The Context Statement provides a frame for Section B of the Claim and enables reviewers to orientate themselves into the evidence provided against each of the two CATE Award criteria. Teams will use the Context Statement to explain the context of their institution and team, the team’s composition and the role(s) and responsibilities within the team. If the narrative in Section B of the Claim draws on evidence from work across different institutions/in the wider sector and/or industry/sector bodies, teams will also explain this in the Context Statement. Teams will also make clear the nature of their practice (e.g. types of learners, discipline(s)/specialist area(s), brief outline of scope and scale of practice undertaken by the team).

The Context Statement should not be used to provide information that would add evidence of impact to the nominated team’s narrative set out in Section B of the Claim.

#### 3.2.2 Section B: Claim against the CATE Award criteria

Nominated teams use Section B of the Claim to set out the evidence of the reach, value and impact of their practice against the two CATE Award criteria. The two parts of Section B together must not exceed 3500 words. As a reviewer, you will ‘score’ each of the two parts separately. Please refer to Sections 4, 5, 6 and 7 below for further information.

### 3.2.3 Section C: Reference List

The Reference List is not 'scored' by reviewers. The purpose of the list is to allow reviewers to find sources and to provide appropriate credit to an author who has inspired any areas of the team's work that are evidenced within Section B of the Claim. It should only include material, which has been cited in Section B. Please note nominated teams should not include hyperlinks to other evidence. If they do so in error, please do not follow these links. The only evidence which reviewers should consider is that discussed in Section B.

Though a word limit is not set for the Reference List, the guidance for nominated teams suggests that, if a nominated team's List has more than approximately 20, or less than 2 references, it is likely to be out of kilter with successful applications. A long list of references is not evidence in itself for any of the CATE criteria. As reviewers are not asked to score the Reference List, there should be no advantage or disadvantage to the nominated team for the number of references they include. The list should not include any citations not directly referred to within the evidence provided in Section B of the Claim. Further guidance for nominated teams on how to use the reference list has been included in section 4.3 of the [CATE 2020 – Guidance for institutions and teams](#).

## 3.3 Statement of Support

The Statement of Support is made and signed by the institution's Vice-Chancellor/Principal/President (or equivalent) (maximum 1000 words). Its purpose is to endorse the claim made by the nominated team and frame the reach, value and impact of the team's practice from an institutional perspective.

The Statement of Support should not be seen as a source of supplementary (or new) evidence; the core aspects of the nominated team's claim, and evidence for these aspects, should be within Section B of the nominated team Claim. The institution's Statement of Support is a complementary document. The Statement of Support should:

- endorse the validity of the nominated team's claim for outstanding impact
- provide institutional context within which the nominated team has been identified as having outstanding impact and outline any future plans to further disseminate their practice
- provide confirmation of institutional support for the nominated team, should they be successful, in terms of carrying out any responsibilities associated with having a CATE Award;
- provide any additional supporting information that might be more appropriately expressed by a Vice-Chancellor/Principal/President (or equivalent), (for example, a perspective on the strategic importance of the team's work and/or change arising as a result of their actions).
- provide the name, job title and signature of the VC/Principal/President (or equivalent). Please note some institutional leads will have nominated a senior leader to complete the statement of support on their behalf.

## 4. Process

### 4.1 Roles and responsibilities of reviewers

As a reviewer for CATE 2020 you are responsible for providing an assessment as to the extent to which the team meets the Award criteria, using the Scoring Rubric (Section 7, Table 3) and feedback to communicate your judgement to applicants and the Panel.

Reviewers are requested to respect the confidentiality of the information contained within the nomination documents and must not disclose any information about individuals or institutions involved, or the content of any nomination, without the prior written consent of the nominated team and Advance HE. The information contained within the nomination and this guidance document must not be used for any purpose other than for peer review of the 2020 CATE nominations you have been allocated.

Please note that comments and/or scores you submit are presented anonymously to the UK Teaching Excellence Awards Advisory Panel, without reference to your name or institution. Advance HE will use reviewers' comments to guide the selection process and also to provide written feedback to the nominated team. Advance HE may also use examples from the assessments, anonymously, to provide additional guidance in future assessment rounds. Your qualitative feedback comments for the nominated team about their Claim in relation to the two CATE Award criteria will be used verbatim wherever possible, and we ask you to consider this in generating your feedback. Comments directed at Advance HE and the Panel only, should be included in the relevant section (see Figure B).

If, in the process of reviewing, you wish to discuss any nomination or have any queries related to the process, please do not hesitate to contact the Teaching Excellence Awards Team at [cate@advance-he.ac.uk](mailto:cate@advance-he.ac.uk) or 01904 717500.

### 4.2 Allocation and access to papers

As a CATE reviewer, you will typically be allocated approximately six nominations to assess. These are randomly assigned to reviewers and thus do not take account of reviewer's discipline or thematic expertise. Each nomination will be independently judged by three reviewers. As a reviewer you score each of the two criterion 0-5. A series of algorithms are applied to differentiate scores and create overall ranking. Where one reviewer's scores are defined as discrepant from the other two reviewers' scores, a fourth reviewer will be used and the three closest scores used in the ranking calculations.

You will be given access to the nominations via the Advance HE VLE and you will be issued with a password to access this site. Along with the nominations there will also be an online form for you to record and submit your scores and feedback.

### 4.3 Conflicts of interest

Advance HE asks that you notify the Teaching Excellence Awards Team at [cate@advance-he.ac.uk](mailto:cate@advance-he.ac.uk) immediately (or as soon as possible) of any potential conflicts of interest related to any one of the nominations you have received. The nomination in question will be reallocated to another reviewer as soon as possible.

Conflict of interest includes, for example, if you :

- are a relative or a personal friend of any of the nominated team or have been previously;