Collaborative Award for Teaching Excellence

CATE 2022: General Feedback on applications

All 2022 CATE nominations were judged against two award criteria which are summarised below:

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.

Criterion 2 - Excellence in the Impact of Collaborative Working: Evidence of the team having a demonstrable impact on teaching and learning beyond their immediate academic or professional area.

Some general themes emerged in the feedback received from all reviewers across the 2022 CATE nominations and a summary of these issues is provided below. It is hoped that this information will help contextualise your reading of your team's feedback which is provided in section 3 of this document.

Areas of strength:

Where reviewers identified areas of strength in the 2022 CATE nominations, the following themes emerged from their feedback:

- There was strong evidence of teams' reach, value and impact, demonstrated in a range of ways.
- Evidence of the team's collaborative approach, particularly with regard to the formation and organisation of the team, and how their approach benefits team members and the wider institution.
- There was clear evidence of the team's authentic partnership with students and external stakeholders, including robust opportunities for these partners to influence the collaboration, and that the collaboration in turn demonstrably enhanced their learning or practice.
- There was clear evidence that students had been empowered within teams to influence the collaboration.
- There was clear evidence of transformational change having been brought about within the institution as a result of the team's work.
- Evidence of long term planning and work with a sustainable future; particularly with regards to how a team will sustain its work across multiple student lifecycles (if relevant).

- Evidence of an inspirational collective response to global challenges.
- Claims were structured or written in an engaging and coherent way.
- The claim received strong endorsement in the Institutional Statement of Support.

Areas for development:

Where reviewers identified areas for development in the 2022 CATE nominations, the following themes emerged from their feedback:

Claims could have been strengthened by providing more practical detail about how the team's collaboration operated. Specific areas that could have been further developed included: the constitution of the team and how team members contributed to the collaboration; how the team collaborated with students; how the team collaborated with those outside the team (either within the institution or external stakeholders); what the aims and objectives of the team were; how the team made decisions and addressed challenges, and how the team went about evaluating their success.

Reviewers reflected that this information helped to create a sense of 'team', beyond a group of individuals performing their roles to an excellent standard.

- Claims could have been strengthened by providing greater evidence of impact; particularly on student learning and outcomes, and on practice in the institution and wider sector.
- Claims could have been strengthened by providing greater evidence of how impact was measured. Specific examples included: a need for more quantitative evidence e.g. progression, retention, attainment rates, etc. to provide greater evidence of impact on student learning, and; a broader range of quantitative and qualitative evidence rather than an overreliance on one type.
- Ensuring consistency in the quality of the evidence provided across both criteria and ensuring that the evidence provided under each criterion was most relevant for that criterion was also highlighted by reviewers.
- Many reviewers made a clear distinction between evidence of co-operation and evidence of deep collaboration.
- In some cases, reviewers reported that focus on various outputs of a team (an event, resource, etc.) took the place of detail on the mechanics of collaboration.
- Ensuring the claim was written and structured in a coherent and effective way was an area for development highlighted by some reviewers.