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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 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 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 three 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 Vice-Chancellor/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 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 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;
are a member of staff at the team’s institution or college or have been previously;
have worked closely with any member of the team in the recent past;
have a vested interest in the institution and/or the team;
have been allocated to review the same team before;
have worked or work closely with a relative or close friend of any member of the team.

If you are unsure whether a particular situation presents a conflict of interest, please do contact the Teaching Excellence Awards Team for an informal discussion, or for clarification. Please note that if you are the member of a team nominated for CATE 2020, you may not take part as a CATE reviewer.

4.4 Monitoring of equality and diversity data

Analysis of Equality and Diversity data for nominees and nominated teams participating in the National Teaching Fellowship Scheme (NTFS) and Collaborative Award for Teaching Excellence (CATE) has identified underrepresentation of Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) staff. This led to an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) being carried out on the Teaching Excellence Awards. One of the recommended actions arising from the EIA in order to promote participation by underrepresented groups, is to promote the opportunity to review for the Awards to a more diverse range of individuals in the hope that this will in turn promote both schemes more widely. In order to monitor the diversity of the reviewer group, from 2020 onwards Equality and Diversity data will be gathered from reviewers on an Equal Opportunities Monitoring Form. This data is used anonymously by Advance HE for statistical monitoring of reviewer, applicant and winner data.

All personal data provided through submitting an Equal Opportunities Monitoring Form will be held confidentially by Advance HE and only relevant documentation will be shared with the UK Teaching Excellence Awards Advisory Panel as explained within this guidance document.

The confidentiality of nominee/nominated team and reviewer data is maintained by Advance HE. Advance HE collates the information provided by all reviewers and nominees and uses this collated data anonymously to report annually on equality and diversity to the UK Teaching Excellence Awards Advisory Panel.

The Equal Opportunities Monitoring Form is online in Online Surveys and will be available to access on the VLE. The form must be completed by each reviewer.

If anyone wishes to know more about how Advance HE collects, stores and uses personal information about the CATE reviewers and nominated teams/nominees please review our privacy statement (Appendix 1).

4.5 Deadlines

The timeline for nominated teams is available in the CATE 2020 – Guidance for institutions and teams. As reviewers, please note the following deadlines and let a member of the Teaching Excellence Awards Team know as soon as possible if any of these dates pose a challenge for you.
4.6 Allocating Scores to Section B of the Claim

This Award uses a best match rather than a threshold approach. Scores are therefore allocated for best match against the criteria, based on the range and quality of the evidence and impact within the nomination.

The Scoring Rubric in section 7 (Table 3) provides the basis for your allocation of scores against each Award criterion. You should score each of the two CATE Award criteria in turn, allocating a score from 0-5 for each of the two criteria. This means that you are scoring each nomination out of a maximum score of 10. Please consider the full range of scores (0-5) and apply the most appropriate one, using whole numbers (do not use fractional scores).

Please remember too that you are scoring the claim, not the individual team, or the team leader who may have written the Claim. Every nominated team has already been identified as excellent in their institution, but you are scoring the Claim they have provided and must consider the evidence of reach, value and impact (see page 14) that has been included in the team’s Claim. If there is no evidence against the specific criteria, despite the team’s identified excellence (from being nominated), you should score 0. In reality, nominated teams do provide evidence, which can come in a variety of forms, and you are scoring the quality of this evidence for reach, value and impact, and are encouraged to use the full range of scores in doing so.

It is important to remember that CATE claims are distinct from traditional academic research projects. This means that the team’s aims and objectives may develop over time rather than be established at the beginning and, equally, that establishing a ‘methodology’ may not be relevant for a CATE team.

Section 7 (Table 3) provides the Scoring Rubric, which is intended to support you in differentiating between the possible scores to be allocated. There is also further guidance on recognising evidence for collaborative activity and reach, value and impact on page 14.

4.7 Giving feedback

Your feedback is crucial to inform the Panel’s decision and also in supporting the nominated team. The feedback template can be seen in Figures A and B, and will be available in the Advance HE VLE for completion.

Your comments will be combined with other reviewers and fed back to the team, verbatim (wherever possible) and anonymously to support their future development. We ask you to be considerate in your use of language when giving feedback. The comments you provide do not need to explain your scoring decisions (although should be aligned). If you wish to explain why you selected a particular score, this can be done via the comments box for the Panel and Advance HE, which will not be seen by the nominated team.
Figure A: Feedback Template – Part 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Number*</th>
<th>Team Leader’s First Name</th>
<th>Team Leader’s Surname</th>
<th>Nominated Team Institution</th>
<th>Reviewer Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* e.g. ‘CATE 101’ which will appear in the file name of the nomination documents you will receive.

Figure B: Feedback Template – Part 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion 1 scores (0 – 5)</th>
<th>Feedback for criterion 1 (up to 150 words max)</th>
<th>Criterion 2 score (0 – 5)</th>
<th>Feedback for criterion 2 (up to 150 words max)</th>
<th>Total score</th>
<th>Overall comments for nominated team (up to 150 words max)</th>
<th>Comments for the Panel/ AHE (up to 150 words max)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.7.1 Types of feedback

We ask you, as a reviewer, to provide three different types of feedback which reflect the extent to which the nomination provides evidence of meeting the CATE 2020 Award criteria in your judgement.

Criteria feedback - up to 150 words per criteria. This is REQUIRED and will be used verbatim (where possible) in feedback to the team. We ask that this is constructive and developmental and includes a balance of comments on the strengths of the nomination and evidence of impact, as well as areas where further evidence of reach, value or impact (see page 14) would be beneficial.

Your comments should clearly relate to your score. It is an important aspect of the CATE scheme that all nominated teams (whether they are selected for the Award or not) will benefit from submitting a nomination. Therefore, please provide as much detail as possible within the word count.

Reviewer ‘scores’ are not shared with nominated teams and so the feedback comments provided by each reviewer are especially important. Teams are very appreciative of your feedback as it will help to guide future areas for development.

Overall feedback – up to 150 words. The overall feedback box is OPTIONAL and used if you noted any overarching comments you would like the team to read. For example, if you note something about their claim as a whole, such as coherence or connectivity across the nomination. Any comments you make in this section will be included in the feedback to the team. Please do not repeat comments already included in your feedback under specific criteria.
Feedback for the Panel/ Advance HE – up to 150 words. The feedback to the Panel is REQUIRED and will be used to guide the decision-making process. This will not be sent to the nominated team and is confidential. In this section you may wish to explain your scoring and/or any specific information, which might help the Panel if they are considering borderline applications, or should they have queries relating to differences between reviewers.

4.7.2 Feedback tone and style

Please bear the following tone and style guidance in mind when writing your feedback to teams:

- The tone of your comments should be respectful, constructive and developmental. Please remember that your feedback is likely to be read by the senior team at the institution as well as by the whole team. Please provide feedback to the nominated team using second person (e.g. you/your, etc.) wherever possible/appropriate;

- The team’s context should be taken into account in constructing your feedback. While you may be familiar with certain approaches or impact, these may not operate in the same way in different contexts. We ask you to be wary of letting your own expectations and assumptions or knowledge of particular contexts influence how you review;

- Note that the team will have selected a range of approaches and/or types of impact evidence to make their claim, which may not necessarily reflect all they are doing to impact upon learning and teaching. Their nomination is a snapshot in time, responding to a limited word count. Thus if you do make suggestions, be mindful of this and focus on the fact the evidence is absent, rather than the approach; keeping comments relevant to reach, value and impact (see pages 14);

- Use positive phrasing wherever possible. Some examples of how negative wording could potentially be reframed are found on Table 1 below:

Table 1: Framing of feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative phrasing</th>
<th>Positive phrasing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘A weakness is …’</td>
<td>‘It would be helpful if …’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘The application fails in …’</td>
<td>‘It would be useful if …’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘There were no …’</td>
<td>‘Further details about …[add specifics]...would strengthen the evidence in this criterion’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘There is a lack of evidence’</td>
<td>‘The case would be stronger with more explicit evidence of...’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘The application lacks…’</td>
<td>‘The team's claim would benefit from more explicit evidence of ...’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘The application needs…’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Much room for improvement’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘There is limited evidence of …’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
‘It is especially weak in terms of…’  ‘Further details could usefully be provided to evidence …[add specifics]’

‘Unfortunately ..’  ‘This example would be strengthened with further evidence of…’

‘To strengthen your claim, you might find it helpful to …’

‘To further develop your evidence for this criterion, the team might wish to …’

Please be wary of repeating the language/wording of the guidance, criteria and nomination; focus instead on the specific strengths and development areas you have noted within the Claim. Likewise, avoid listing examples or text from the nomination in your feedback as this can be frustrating; the team knows what they included in their Claim. If you are intending this list of examples to be seen as identified strengths, try to be explicit and say so;

Avoid subjective and personal comments, including for example: ‘I enjoyed reading…’ ‘I liked …’, ‘I suggest…’, ‘I think…’ or thanking the team for their Claim. Instead focus on how far the nomination has met the criteria;

Avoid hyperbolic (and potentially patronising) language and punctuation like ‘fabulous’, ‘fantastic’, ‘bravo!’ and using exclamation marks;

Please make sure sentences are clearly constructed and you are not using terms which are specific to particular contexts, such as institutional or discipline contexts. Avoid acronyms;

Check for contradictions in your feedback – e.g. saying there was too much context in one criterion, and then asking for more context in the general comments, or providing conflicting feedback across the two criteria;

Check that your feedback aligns with your scores. So, for example, if you are saying a section would benefit from more evidence of impact it is probably not a 4 or a 5;

Keep the purpose and criteria of the Award in mind when reviewing the evidence, and be mindful not to let the examples provided or indeed your own expectations influence your feedback. Thus it wouldn’t be appropriate to suggest, or imply, that the team needs to be more innovative or creative, publish more or extend their reach of some area of their work, where this doesn’t relate to the criteria. However, where the team refers to being innovative, creative, having published or extended their reach, as evidence of the impact of their work within their particular context, or beyond their immediate area, it should be given due credit;

Please proof read your feedback before uploading it to make sure that the team can follow clearly what you have said about their Claim.
5 CATE 2020 Award Criteria

All teams will be assessed on the evidence provided in the Nominated Team Claim (Section B) in relation to each of the two CATE Award criteria:

CATE Criterion 1: Excellence in the team’s collaborative approach
Evidence of excellence in the team’s approach to working collaboratively, commensurate with their context and the opportunities afforded by it.

CATE Criterion 2: Excellence in the impact of collaborative working
Evidence of the team having a demonstrable impact on teaching and learning, including beyond their immediate academic or professional area.

Each of the two CATE Award criteria above is given equal consideration in the assessment process and weighted equally in the overall score. You will score against each of the two criteria in turn, allocating a score (0-5) for each criterion.

In allocating scores, please consider the following:

- **Reach** - the scale of influence;
- **Value** - benefit derived for students and staff;
- **Impact** - the difference that has been made to policy, practice and/or student outcomes.

Further explanation of Reach, Value and Impact can be found on page 14.

There are many different ways of evidencing each of the Award criteria, as appropriate to the nature of the team’s work. Some illustrative examples are given below, but nominated teams should not feel limited by these examples as they are included only to provide indicative types of evidence against each criterion.

**Key points to note:**

- Teams should use Section B of the Claim to address and provide evidence against each Award criterion in turn;
- Teams will need to draw upon explicit evidence of impact to support their Claim against each criterion. Some examples of typical sources are (but need not be confined to):
  - student feedback and evaluations;
  - feedback from peer observations;
  - departmental or institutional annual reviews or evaluations;
  - feedback from other national engagements;
  - student support materials;
  - work with other partner institutions and organisations;
  - quantitative data to indicate the scale, reach and impact of the nominated team’s work.
- Teams should demonstrate that they are applying the principles of equality, diversity and inclusion to their practice.
The decision about what constitutes appropriate evidence of impact rests with the nominating institution and the nominated team, but teams are encouraged to ensure that the student voice is made explicit within Section B of the Claim. Teams from various academic disciplines or roles inevitably demonstrate different communication and analytical styles and reviewers should account for this in the assessment process. There is no one ‘style’ that is expected in applications and examples should be assessed and scored for their contribution to the relevant criterion as a whole.

**Reach, Value and Impact**

Reviewers should look for evidence that demonstrates the reach, value and impact of the nominated team’s practice. Teams should be mindful of this requirement and aim to provide evidence that demonstrates a balance of these three qualities across the Claim.

**Reach** - The scale of influence. Though ‘geographic’ reach may be important for some nominated teams, it is useful to consider other ways that a nominated team can demonstrate reach. Some teams may demonstrate reach at a department/faculty/institution/national/global level, for example, but others might provide evidence of how their practice has reached different groups of students, individuals and/or organisations (e.g. postgraduates, commuter students, BAME students, online learners, etc.).

**Value** - The benefit derived for students and staff (which may take different forms). Value may include qualitative evidence such as a change in approach to learning among students or staff. For example, evidence may be provided about how the work being described has added value to the student learning experience or to teaching practice. Value may also relate to the quality of enhanced experiences and the meaningfulness of practices. Some nominated teams may also be working in settings where there are positive explicit ethical elements to their practice.

**Impact** - The difference that has been made to policy, practice and/or student outcomes as the result of an activity. The focus here is on explicit evidence of positive change taking place. Impact evidence can be both quantitative and qualitative, but it is important to show how the activities described have changed teaching practice and/or learning outcomes.

**Cooperative v. Collaborative Team Working**

Nominated teams should aim to capture evidence of their collaborative working under both criteria. Collaboration is a state of interdependence that is likely to be much deeper than simply co-operating as members of a team. Successful Claims are likely to encompass aspects of practice that go beyond describing how the team works with others. The ethos of CATE is a recognition of team working as an important element of successful HE practice. Nominated teams should expect to describe how the team was established, has developed and how it continues to work to achieve effective impact.

The graphic below (reproduced with the permission of John Spencer) outlines some key distinctions between the two concepts. The qualities of collaboration listed in this illustration provide a useful prompt for nominated teams to collect effective evidence of this way of working, and may help you as a reviewer identify evidence of excellence in collaboration within a team.

You should expect to see some discussion of how the team works as a team – what their approach to team working is and how this shapes their practice.
How does being an effective team enable them to work successfully? Who are the team members, and what are their roles? How is collaboration enabling them to be more than the sum of the parts?

6 Evidencing the CATE Award criteria

Table 2 below provides a range of examples of the types of evidence that you might find under each of the two Award criteria. These are only indicative and hence you will not find all of these AND you may also find some relevant approaches or practices in a Claim that are not listed. Please do not use the examples as a ‘checklist’ when determining your allocation of scores. Rather consider a balance between the types and range of evidence and the reach, value and impact presented, as fitting with the team’s context. Likewise, try to ensure your feedback comments align with and reflect your score.
Table 2: Examples of types of evidence against each of the CATE Award criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence of excellence in the team’s approach to working collaboratively, commensurate with their context and the opportunities afforded by it.</th>
<th>Evidence of the team having a demonstrable impact on teaching and learning, including beyond their immediate academic or professional area.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Criterion 1 is focused primarily on the approach to and value of working collaboratively, and planning for reach and impact. To give some illustrative examples, Criterion 1 could be demonstrated by providing evidence of excellence in terms of:  
+ having a clear set of aims, objectives and rationale for the team’s approach and how the group constitutes a team and developed as a team;  
+ demonstrating direct engagement of students within or with the team;  
+ illustrating how the team has contributed to wider thematic and sector priorities, for example: assessment and feedback; retention; employability; staff development; students as partners; technology and social media;  
+ working collaboratively with a range of stakeholder groups;  
+ embedding practices across different programmes, disciplines, campuses or institutions;  
+ being flexible and creative in working to address unanticipated situations or events;  
+ processes in place for measuring the impact or outcomes of collaborative work. | Criterion 2 is focused on showing the reach and impact of the team’s work and value beyond the initial context. To give some illustrative examples, Criterion 2 could be demonstrated by providing evidence of:  
+ the reach of the team’s work;  
+ the wider value that has resulted from working as a team;  
+ the impact of supporting colleagues and/or influencing support for student learning;  
+ the impact on student learning or outcomes;  
+ the impact of any outcomes/outputs of collaborative work. |
7 CATE 2020 Scoring Rubric

Use the Scoring Rubric below to ‘score’ each of the two parts to Section B of the nominated team’s Claim against each of the two CATE Award criteria (i.e. an overall maximum score of 10 from each of the three reviewers).

**Table 3: CATE 2020 Scoring Rubric**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Scoring Profile</th>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>5 points</th>
<th>4 points</th>
<th>3 points</th>
<th>2 points</th>
<th>1 point</th>
<th>0 point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion 1:</strong> Excellence in the team’s collaborative approach</td>
<td>+ outstanding evidence of excellence in the team’s approach to working collaboratively, commensurate with their context.</td>
<td>+ very good evidence of excellence in the team’s approach to working collaboratively, commensurate with their context.</td>
<td>+ good evidence of excellence in the team’s approach to working collaboratively, commensurate with their context.</td>
<td>+ satisfactory evidence of excellence in the team’s approach to working collaboratively, commensurate with their context.</td>
<td>+ limited evidence of excellence in the team’s approach to working collaboratively, commensurate with their context.</td>
<td>+ poor/no evidence of excellence, and fails to demonstrate the team’s impact on teaching and learning, going beyond their academic or professional area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion 2:</strong> Excellence in the impact of collaborative working</td>
<td>+ outstanding evidence which fully demonstrates the team’s impact on teaching and learning, going beyond their academic or professional area.</td>
<td>+ very good evidence which clearly demonstrates the team’s impact on teaching and learning, going beyond their academic or professional area.</td>
<td>+ good evidence which demonstrates the team’s impact on teaching and learning, going beyond their academic or professional area.</td>
<td>+ satisfactory evidence which partially demonstrates the team’s impact on teaching and learning, going beyond their academic or professional area.</td>
<td>+ limited evidence which rarely demonstrates the team’s impact on teaching and learning, going beyond their academic or professional area.</td>
<td>+ poor/no evidence of excellence, and fails to demonstrate the team’s impact on teaching and learning, going beyond their academic or professional area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8 Outcomes

The names of all of the 2020 CATE winners will be officially announced in week beginning August 3rd 2020 on Advance HE’s website.

Nominated teams will receive their feedback following this announcement.

Thank you

Advance HE would like to thank you most sincerely for the time and expertise you have provided in supporting the Collaborative Award for Teaching Excellence 2020 scheme.
Appendix 1: CATE 2020 privacy statement

Schedule 1: Data Protection

This schedule describes how Advance HE collects and use personal information about you when you submit your nomination to us. For the purpose of data protection legislation, including the Data Protection Act 2018 (the “DPA”), Advance HE is the “data controller”. This means that we are responsible for deciding how we hold and use personal information about you. We are required under data protection legislation to notify you of the information contained in this schedule.

Advance HE is a company limited by guarantee incorporated in England and Wales under company number 4931031 and registered as a charity in England under charity number 1101607 and in Scotland under charity number SC043946. Our registered office address is: Innovation Way, York Science Park, York YO10 5BR. We can also be contacted by email at data.protection@advance-he.ac.uk or by phone on 01904 717500.

How we will protect your personal information

Advance HE is committed to holding personal information you provide to us securely.

Where personal information is held electronically, it is held on a computer system that is owned and controlled by Advance HE or such other third party appointed by Advance HE.

To effectively administer the scheme, Advance HE stores the details supplied on this form, and the nomination documentation, in both paper and electronic format. Paper copies are held locally by Advance HE at its offices or securely by our staff, contractors or offsite storage facilities. Sometimes we will make electronic copies of paper documents or type up information from them. These documents or information are then stored on our computer system.

The nomination process is via the Advance HE’s VLE system. All the information that you provide to us will be transmitted to and stored on our secure servers or the servers of such other third party who we may appoint from time to time to host the VLE and/or to store information.

We will only retain your personal information for as long as necessary to fulfil the purposes we collected it for (see “What we use your information for” below).

**Successful Nominees/Nominated Teams:** Advance HE will store and process your personal information for the length of time that you are a National Teaching Fellow.

**Unsuccessful Nominated Teams:** To determine the appropriate retention period for personal data, we consider the amount, nature, and sensitivity of the personal data, the potential risk of harm from unauthorised use or disclosure of your personal data, the purposes for which we process your personal data and whether we can achieve those purposes through other means, and the applicable legal requirements. Advance HE will ensure that our suppliers and selected third parties with whom we share your personal information in accordance with this schedule will delete your personal information once there is no longer a reason for retaining it.
What we use the information contained in this form for:

The situations in which we will process your personal information are listed below:

- Communicating with you about your nomination.
- Administration purposes including establishing, amending, closing or renewing user accounts for the VLE.
- Evaluating and analysing the information provided by you in your forms.
- Dealing with any queries or complaints in relation to your application for the National Teaching Fellowship Scheme.
- Generating reports for internal use by us, our staff and the UK Teaching Excellence Awards Advisory panel in relation to your nomination.

Our lawful basis for these activities is necessity to perform our contract with you (as we commit to you to review and process your nomination).

- Appointing third party service providers to use your personal data for our purposes (not the purposes of the third party) on our behalf, under our instruction such as support services for use of the VLE, to external peer reviewers as well as to members of the panel as part of the assessment process, to third parties assisting Advance HE to inform future review processes and evaluation activities.
- Keeping in touch with you to send you details about service information, our products and services, surveys, newsletters, events, courses, seminars and workshops.

Our lawful basis for these activities is the pursuit of our legitimate interests to engage external support to deliver the National Teaching Fellowship Scheme and to raise our profile within the teaching community.

- Where we wish to use data for other purposes, we may anonymise your information so that it cannot be linked to you. In that case, it will cease to be personal data and we may use the anonymised data for any purpose.

Sharing your information:

We may pass your information on to the following third parties and/or internal teams or departments at Advance HE and for the following purposes:

- Your employer for the purposes of networking and professional development.
- Our suppliers who provide services on our behalf such as IT providers who own, manage or provide support for our computers or systems we use and our suppliers who provide the VLE or other software.
- Our staff or individuals that we appoint to review your nomination and other information that you provide in your nomination documentation. Partner organisations we may use to deliver the National Teaching Fellowship Scheme and the Award ceremony.
- Partner organisations we may use to deliver the National Teaching Fellowship Scheme and the Award ceremony.

We may sometimes be obliged to disclose your personal information by law such as by a regulator with appropriate power, or court order. In addition, information held by or for public bodies can be subject to freedom of information requests.
Your duty to inform us of changes:
It is important that the personal information we hold about you is accurate and current. Please keep us informed if your personal information changes during your working relationship with us.

Your rights in connection with personal information:
Under certain circumstances, by law you have the right to:

- Request access to your personal information (commonly known as a “data subject access request”). This enables you to receive a copy of the personal information we hold about you and to check that we are lawfully processing it.
- Request correction of the personal information that we hold about you. This enables you to have any incomplete or inaccurate information we hold about you corrected.
- Request erasure of your personal information. This enables you to ask us to delete or remove personal information where there is no good reason for us continuing to process it. You also have the right to ask us to delete or remove your personal information where you have exercised your right to object to processing (see below).
- Object to processing of your personal information where we are relying on a legitimate interest (or those of a third party) and there is something about your particular situation which makes you want to object to processing on this ground.
- Request the restriction of processing of your personal information. This enables you to ask us to suspend the processing of personal information about you, for example if you want us to establish its accuracy or the reason for processing it.
- Request the transfer of your personal information to another party.

If you want to review, verify, correct or request erasure of your personal information, object to the processing of your personal data, or request that we transfer a copy of your personal information to another party, please contact the Teaching Excellence Awards Team in writing.

No fee usually required:
You will not have to pay a fee to access your personal information (or to exercise any of the other rights). However, we may charge a reasonable fee if your request for access if clearly unfounded or excessive. Alternatively, we may refuse to comply with the request in such circumstances.

What we may need from you:
We may need to request specific information from you to help us confirm your identity and ensure your right to access the information (or to exercise any of your other rights). This is another appropriate security measure to ensure that personal information is not disclosed to any person who has no right to receive it.
You have the right to complain to the Information Commissioner (http://www.ico.gov.uk/) if you have any concerns in respect of the handling of your personal information by Advance HE.